DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 292 468 IR 052 314

TITLE	Performance Appraisal in Research Libraries. SPEC Kit 140.
INSTITUTION	Association of Research Libraries, Washington, D.C. Office of Management Studies.
PUB DATE	Jan 88
NOTE	114p.; For an earlier SPEC Kit on this topic, see ED 251 108.
AVAILABLE FROM	Association of Research Libraries, Systems and Procedures Exchange Center, Office of Management Studies, 1527 New Hampshire Ave., N.W., Washington, DC 20036 ($20.00 prepaid).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - General (020) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Libraries; *Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; Faculty Promotion; Higher Education; Job Performance; Library Administration; *Library Personnel; *Library Standards; Merit Rating; Peer Evaluation; *Personnel Evaluation; Professional Development; Research Libraries; Tenure

ABSTRACT

This kit and flyer produced by the Systems and Procedures Exchange Center of the Association of Research Libraries provides documents submitted by 14 universities that are used in the performance evaluation of professional library staff. Commentary based on a thorough review of documents submitted by 60 libraries includes an overview of the responses; a discussion of criteria used in making qualitative judgments; appraisal materials and guidelines used; peer and merit increase review; and trends and issues. Tabulated survey results are followed by documents arranged in three categories: (1) Overviews of Procedures--University of California at Los Angeles, Texas A&M University, University of Oregon, University of Notre Dame, Northwestern University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University; (2) Peer Review--University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, University of Kansas, and University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; (3) Merit Increase Review--University of California at Riverside, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Stanford University, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, and Kent State University. A number of the documents include copies of forms used in the evaluation process, and a 10-item bibliography is provided. (EW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Maxine Sitts

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

spec

System and Procedures Exchange Center

ORDER FORM

(202) 232-8656

THIS FORM SERVES AS A PROFORMA INVOICE **FED. ID #52-0784198-N**

*** * * KITS ALSO ARE AVAILABLE BY SUBSCRIPTION, FROM VENDORS OR DIRECT * * ***

To order, fill out below and send with PREPAYMENT* to: ARL Office of Management Studies, 1527 New Hampshire Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20036. Claims must be made withing 90 days. (*ARL library members may be billed. ARL per-Kit cost is $10.00)

Purchase Order #:_____ Shipping Address: _____

Date: ____/ ____/ ____

_____

OMS Client No.:_____
(see mailing label)

_____

TOTAL NUMBER of Kits ordered: _____ _____ (ZIP) _____

X_____ **$20 per Kit ($25 outside U.S.)**

TOTAL AMOUNT ENCLOSED $_____

For Internal Use

Date: ____/ ____/ ____
Postage

PREPAYMENT IS REQUIRED

_____ 141.Approval Plans
_____ 140.Performance Appraisal
_____ 139.Evaluation/Reference
_____ 138.University Copyright Policies
_____ 137.Preservation Guidelines
_____ 136.Management Copy Cataloging
_____ 135.Job Analysis
_____ 134.Planning Mngt. Statistics
_____ 133.Optical Discs
_____ 132.Library-Scholar Communic.
_____ 131.Collection Develop.Organiz.
_____ 130.Retrospective Conversion
_____ 129.Organization Charts
_____ 128.Systems Office Organiz.
_____ 127.Interlibrary Loan
_____ 126.Automated Library Systems
_____ 125.Tech.Services Cost Studies
_____ 124.Barcoding of Collections
_____ 123.Micro.Software Policies
_____ 122.End-User Search Services
_____ 121.Bibliographic Instruction
_____ 120.Exhibits
_____ 119.Catalog Maintenance Online
_____ 118.Unionization
_____ 117.Gifts and Exchange Function
_____ 116.Organizing for Preservation
_____ 115.Photocopy Services
_____ 114.Binding Operations

_____ 113.Preservation Education
_____ 111.Coop.Collection Development
_____ 110.Local Cataloging Policies
_____ 109.Staff Training Automation
_____ 108.Strategic Planning
_____ 107.University Archives
_____ 106.Electronic Mail
_____ 105.Nonbibl. Databases
_____ 104.Microcomputers
_____ 103.Asst./Assc.Director Position
_____ 102.Copyright Policies
_____ 101.User Studies
_____ 100.Collection Security
_____ 99.Branch Libraries
_____ 97.Building Renovation
_____ 96.Online Catalogs
_____ 95.Lib.Materials Cost Studies
_____ 90.Integrated Lib.Info.Systm
_____ 86.Professional Development
_____ 85.Personnel Classif.Systems
_____ 84.Public Serv.Goals-Objs.
_____ 83.Approval Plans
_____ 82.Document Delivery Systems
_____ 81.Services to Disabled
_____ 80.Specialty Positions
_____ 79.Internships/Job Exchanges
_____ 78.Recruitment-Selection
_____ 76.Online Bibliog.Search Servs.

SEE BACK

_____ 75.Staff Development
_____ 74.Fees for Services
_____ 73.External User Servs.
_____ 72.Executive Review
_____ 70.Preservation Procedures
_____ 68.AACR2 Implement.Studies
_____ 67.Affirmative Action Progs.
_____ 64.Indirect Cost Rates
_____ 63.Collective Bargaining
_____ 57.Special Collections
_____ 56.External Communication
_____ 54.Internal Communication
_____ 49.Use of Annual Reports
_____ 48.External Fund Raising
_____ 47.Automated Cataloging
_____ 46.Planning Card Catalog
_____ 31.Allocation of Resources
_____ 29.The Systems Function
_____ 20.Manager-Tech.Specialists
_____ 19.Staff Associations
_____ 8.Collective Bargaining
_____ 7.Personnel Classif.Schemes
_____ 3.Personnel Organization
_____ 1.Organization Charts

* * *

SPEC Kits (ISSN 0160 3582) are available by subscription through subscription services or direct from the publisher. Individual issues cost $20.00, plus $5.00 postage outside the U.S., through distributors or direct. (ARL member price $10.00.) Prepayment is required. If ordering direct, send check payable to "ARL Office of Management Studies" to: SPEC, Office of Management Studies, 1527 New Hampshire Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Order by Kit Number and Title.

spec flyer
#140, January 1988
OMS
Systems and Procedures Exchange Center
ISSN 0160 3582

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

Since the SPEC survey on performance appraisal nine years ago, well over half the members of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) have updated their policies and procedures, creating systematic processes for evaluating employees' performance. However, questions still remain concerning the flexibility of these systems, as well as such issues as peer review, merit increases, and the linking of appraisal with salary adjustments.

SPEC first issued a Kit and Flyer on performance review in December 1974. At that time, there was only the earliest indication that performance appraisal systems were becoming useful library management tools. A second Kit and Flyer published in April 1979, based on a limited telephone survey, commented that "new approaches to performance review are oriented toward contributing to organizational goals, opening lines of communication between the supervisor and employees, and developing staff members."

In the Spring and Summer of 1987, a fresh look at performance appraisal began with a "Call for Documents" to all ARL libraries. The commentary which follows is based on a thorough review of documents from libraries which responded to that call. The questions posed of the libraries dealt with recent revisions to criteria and procedures, the use of peer review, and issues needing to be addressed. (See the opening pages of the Kit.)

OVERVIEW OF RESPONSES. Seventy-one institutions responded to the 1987 "Call", with 60 libraries providing documents. Responses dealt almost exclusively with professional staff. Among all respondents, 42% (30) have revised their criteria within the past 5 years, and almost 58% (41) have revised their procedures. Forty-five (63%) respondents do not employ a peer review system, while 21 libraries (30%) regularly use such a system for professionals. Four use peer review only under special circumstances, e.g., for promotion or tenure.

Generally, research libraries treat performance appraisal as an important, formal communication process, and they exert strenuous effort to devise processes that are open, multidirectional, and designed to encourage rather than dishearten. It is evident from the documents that appraisal is among the most complex and demanding of administrative processes. Definitions of terms—especially of the qualities sought in employees and the meaning of various performance levels—tend be highly specific; several libraries provide detailed glossaries to explain their terminology. Some have developed a minimum list of standard questions which must be answered for all reviews.

Considerable effort has been applied to instruction in performance appraisal. Several institutions convene all librarians each year for an orientation session. Some offer detailed guidance on the principles of interviewing, while others supply university-wide or statewide booklets outlining suggested appraisal practices. Forms normally provide opportunity for reviewees to give feedback and comment, regarded as crucial elements of open communication. Opportunity for self-evaluation is frequent, with some libraries having separate worksheets for that purpose. In four institutions, evaluation documents are bidirectional, with librarians given the opportunity to evaluate their supervisors via a detailed instrument.

CRITERIA. Documents indicate heavy reliance on qualitative judgment to reach decisions. However, a few libraries associate weighted or unweighted numerical scores with each criterion and derive a total for ranking purposes. Typically, a numbered scale runs from 1 to 5; an unnumbered five-rank scale, from totally inadequate to outstanding, is common. Some use three rankings: *Does Not Meet Standards, Meets Standards, and Exceeds Standards.* One institution employs an eight-point scale.

Criteria can be quite detailed, with major categories having up to 15 different subcategories including, for example, under *Scholarly and Professional Achievement: Serving as Referee for an Article, Editing a Journal, Moderating a Panel, Preparing a Successful Grant Proposal.* Some libraries use a broader, more generalized—but not less extensive—set of criteria: *Quality, Productivity, Workplace Interactions, and Contributions,* all tied to the university's goals and objectives. Two large government libraries call for carefully defining the critical elements of a position, where a decline in performance would require remedial action, removal or demotion. In university settings, appraisal criteria

and standards for librarians generally reflect the academic expectations for faculty; they center around performance in assigned responsibilities; professional growth; research (scholarly and professional achievement, publications); service to university and public; and for library administrators, administrative and management effectiveness.

PROCEDURES. Appraisal materials and guidelines for librarians tend to be flexible and open, compared with those for clerical/support staff where checklists or similar highly structured forms and procedures are preferred. Mutual goal setting by employee and supervisor is a frequent component of the process. Typically, the larger institutions issue longer, more complex compilations of procedures backed up by university statutes and regulations. Regardless of institution size, substantial attention is given to due process, e.g., warning letters, grievance and appeal procedures.

Most institutions differentiate performance appraisal procedures for veterans and new hires/transfers; most take into account special circumstances (e.g., extended illness) that might impinge on performance. As an aid to evaluating the performance of librarians one institution regularly conducts an elaborate, machine-scored evaluation of the branch unit—clearly an attempt to increase the objectivity of the process by divorcing personality from unit performance.

PEER AND MERIT INCREASE REVIEW. There is great variation in the formation and structure of peer review bodies. Some committees are elected by the library faculty, some appointed solely by the director, and some set up by a mix of appointment and election; some are appointed by the director from a slate nominated by staff. Some peer review systems deal with both promotion and merit increases; however, administration generally holds exclusive control over the granting of merit increases. In most cases promotion systems are geared to specific salary and grade steps that accord with rank. In both private and public institutions merit increases are doled out from an appropriation. Promotion review committees, and very often the director, generally have only recommendatory powers, the final decision being reserved to the provost or other senior academic officer.

Policies on confidentiality vary widely: some committees meet openly with the candidates, while in other cases committee membership and deliberations are held in the strictest secrecy. Two institutions conduct secret, faculty-wide balloting to confirm a recommendation of promotion or tenure. In a few instances the director sits in on the committee's deliberations but does not participate in discussion. A common practice is to require destruction of any records of the peer review group while permanently retaining all submitted documentation.

TRENDS AND ISSUES. ARL libraries recognize the importance of the performance appraisal process, as well as the responsibilities it involves, and have given it considerable attention and support over the past five years. Major changes that were in the planning stages a few years back have been implemented. As a result, research libraries are spelling out their performance policies and procedures in considerable detail. While providing numerous benefits and safeguards, performance appraisal systems also have created some concerns regarding their flexibility. How does a library maintain a stance with its employees that allows for open communication and change regarding appraisal as the policies and procedures become more complex?

A number of continuing issues illustrate libraries' attempts to further define appraisal processes, as well as to maintain openness to changing organizational patterns and job responsibilities and skills. Concerns regarding refinement of appraisal procedures include: How to increase the specifics justifying various actions; how to obtain more accountability at all administrative levels; and how to maintain uniformity and objectivity of application through several levels of review, especially where peer review is in effect.

Questions that reflect the changing nature of library organizations and work include: How an appraisal system can best recognize new forms of creativity such as applications of new technology and software development; and how a supervisor can best evaluate work done for and paid by other units and those who work for more than one supervisor?

Finally, a number of respondents expressed interest in investigating the relationship of performance appraisal to salary action. Some libraries link them strongly and explicitly, while other institutions, claiming greater objectivity, decouple performance appraisal from the salary decision.

The SPEC Kit on Performance Appraisal (#140, January 1988) contains the Call for Documents form, seven overviews of performance appraisal systems, three documents related to peer review, three documents related to merit systems, and a selected reading list.

* * *

This flyer and kit was prepared by Allen B. Veaner, Toronto, as part of the OMS Collaborative Research Writing Program.

SPEC Flyer copyright© 1988 by Association of Research Libraries, Office of Management Studies. This SPEC Flyer may not be reproduced in any form without permission from the publisher.

SPEC Kits (ISSN 0160 3582) are available by subscription through subscription services or direct from the publisher. Individual issues cost $20.00, plus $5.00 postage outside the U.S. (ARL member cost is $10.00.) Prepayment is required. If ordering direct, send check payable to "ARL Office of Management Studies" to: SPEC, Office of Management Studies, 1527 New Hampshire Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Order by Kit Number and Title.

spec

Table of Contents

OMS

Systems and Procedures Exchange Center

ISSN 0160 3582

Performance Appraisal
Kit #140
January 1988

TABULATED SURVEY RESULTS 1

OVERVIEWS OF PROCEDURES

University of California, Los Angeles — "Performance Evaluation," from Staff Personnel Manual, 12/85..... 2

Texas A&M University — Faculty Evaluation Procedure, 3/85.. 4

University of Oregon — Summary of Faculty Evaluation Procedures, 1/87..... 6

University of Notre Dame — Annual Faculty Performance Appraisal Procedures, 4/86..... 19

Northwestern University — Performance Evaluation Process..... 21

Massachusetts Institute of Technology — MIT Libraries Performance Evaluation System for Librarians and Other Academic Staff..... 22

Virginia Polytechnic Inst. and State University — Faculty Evaluation Procedures, 1985-1986..... 25

PEER REVIEW

University of Illinois, at Urbana-Champaign — Visiting Committee Procedures: Evaluation of Job Performance of Departmental Library Service Faculty 2/87. 34

University of Kansas — Report of the Ad Hoc Peer Review Task Force, 10/87..... 43

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill — Selections from Structure for the Ranking of Librarians, 3/86..... 50

MERIT INCREASE REVIEW

University of California at Riverside — Criteria for Personnel Action, 2/86. 54

University of Illinois, at Urbana-Champaign — Departmental Library Services: Merit Evaluation Procedures, 12/86..... 62

Stanford University — Merit Ranking Guidelines, 3/85..... 68

MERIT INCREASE REVIEW (continued)
Southern Illinois University at Carbondale — Standards and Criteria for Library Affairs Merit Salary System, 1985-1987..... 83

Kent State University — Library Administration Faculty Merit Awards: Distribution Guidelines & Procedures, 1986-1987..... 95

SELECTED READING LIST..... 100

Tabulated Survey Results

System and Procedures Exchange Center

April 21, 1987 OMS

Office of Management Studies, Association of Research Libraries
1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 • 202-232-8656

CALL FOR DOCUMENTS ON PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

Many ARL libraries have requested an updated SPEC Kit on Performance Appraisal. The last kit covering this topic was issued in 1979 (#53), and many changes have occurred over the past eight years.

To assist in preparing the flyer and kit, we are requesting your responses to the three questions below, as well as copies of readily-available documents relating to performance appraisal policies and procedures at your library.

For example, we are intested in:

- Policies, procedures, forms used in performance appraisal
- Criteria, standards, and performance expectations by which performance is appraised
- Committee reports/internal studies of the library's performance appraisal system, including recommendations for change.
- Peer review materials, such as rationales, procedures, and reports on effectiveness.

To be most useful, we need your readily-available materials and responses by

May 31, 1987.

RESPONDENT 71 Respondents _____ TITLE _____

PHONE NUMBER FOR FURTHER CONTACT: (area code) _____

LIBRARY/INSTITUTION _____

1. When did your library last revise -- or when will it be revising -- its:

	Performance Appraisal Criteria		Performance Appraisal Procedures	
More than five years ago	19	5 NA	10	5 NA
Within the past five years	32		41	
Currently revising	13		13	
Within the next year or two	2		2	

2. Does your library use peer review as part of its performance appraisal process? 21 YES 45 NO 5 NA If YES, enclose documents.

3. What issues related to performance appraisal would you like to see addressed in the kit and flyer? (Use back of this form, or enclose library documents that address concerns.)

* * * * * *

Return this form, along with readily available documents, by **May 31, 1987** to SPEC/OMS, 1527 New Hampshire Ave., N.W., Washington, DC 20036.

Overviews of Procedures

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

255 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

POLICY

255.1 The performance of each employee shall be evaluated periodically and written evaluations shall be used as a basis for appropriate personnel actions.

RESPONSIBILITY

255.2 The Chancellor shall establish necessary campus regulations and procedures to provide a performance evaluation program and to assure that the work performance of each employee is evaluated by the employee's supervisor in accordance with the provisions of this policy. Performance evaluations shall include:

a. discussions to reach understanding of duties, responsibilities, and objectives;

b. review of progress and performance to date and, as appropriate, planning for more effective performance; in addition, for each supervisor having direct responsibility for meeting established commitments to equal employment opportunity and affirmative action goals, a review of the individual's good faith efforts in these areas will be included in the performance evaluation;

c. the opportunity for each employee to ask questions about work assignments and to review interest in upgrading present skills and in future development; and

d. written performance reviews sufficiently specific to inform and guide the employee and to provide direction for management in personnel decisions.

SCOPE

255.3 Timing and Number of Evaluations. The supervisor shall conduct written performance evaluations, as follows:

a. for each employee in career position who has attained regular status, at least once each year;

b. for each probationary employee, as provided in Staff Personnel Policy 250; and

c. for each other employee on the basis of the employee's performance and progress, as determined by the supervisor.

255.4 In addition, the supervisor should review performance at any time there is a question concerning an employee's performance or conduct.

255.5 Evaluation Forms. The Assistant Vice President--Employee Relations shall establish necessary performance evaluation guides and forms. The Chancellor may, with approval of the Senior Vice President--Administration, establish alternate evaluation guides and forms in accordance with the provisions of this policy.

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY

STERLING C. EVANS LIBRARY
FACULTY EVALUATION PROCEDURE

I. Responsibility of the Faculty Member

A. Review the job description for the position, noting areas which may need revision.

B. Critically review your activities for the past year; consider achievements as well as areas requiring development in both work performance and professional growth. Note goals and objectives you may wish to pursue in the coming year.

C. Be prepared to discuss all areas of job performance and professional growth and to discuss aspects of the job environment which affect job performance.

II. Responsibility of the Supervisor

A. Review the job description and the Inventory of Performance, Professional Service, and Growth.

B. Consider the faculty member's strengths and weaknesses.

C. Consider means for meeting the development needs of the faculty member.

D. During the appraisal interview, inquire about problems or obstacles which affect the faculty member's job satisfaction and professional development.

E. Ask the faculty member for suggestions on how you can help him/her on the job. Seek feedback on how your behavior and attitude affect his/her job performance.

F. Discuss only a few major areas in which the faculty member should consider development. Together, set goals or short term objectives for the coming year. Plan for training opportunities, personal growth, development of the faculty member's strengths.

III. Procedure

A. Evaluation forms will be distributed to the faculty member no later than June 16 or August 1, depending on the faculty member's term of appointment for the summer. The evaluation period to be covered will be the previous September 1 through the current August 31. The faculty member will fill out the Inventory of Performance, Professional Service, and Growth and submit it to his/her supervisor.

B. The supervisor will complete the evaluation form and attach it to the faculty member's Inventory. Before meeting with the faculty member, the supervisor should review the completed forms with the appropriate division head, assistant director, or director.

C. The supervisor will arrange an appraisal interview with the faculty member specifying a date, time and place. Both should allow adequate time and arrange for a private meeting place.

D. The faculty member will be given the opportunity to review the comments of the supervisor prior to the interview.

E. The faculty member being evaluated shall be given ample time in private to comment in writing on any aspect of the evaluation. He/she should check the appropriate category regarding optional review and return the evaluation form to the supervisor.

F. The forms should be hand-carried by the supervisor to the appropriate division head, who will evaluate the faculty member and discuss the evaluation with the faculty member.

G. On or before November 1, completed evaluation forms should be hand-carried to the appropriate assistant director, who will discuss the evaluation with the faculty member in a personal conference. The assistant director will deliver the form to the Library director, who also will discuss the evaluation with the faculty member in a personal conference. Personal conferences will be completed by January 31.

H. The faculty member has the option to request a written evaluation and appraisal interview with either the appropriate assistant director, the assistant director and the director, or (in the case of a division head) with the director. If this option is selected, appraisal interviews will be completed prior to November 1.

I. The faculty member has the option of signing the evaluation at any point beginning with the interview with the supervisor or waiting until the completion of an appraisal interview or a personal conference with the assistant director or director.

3/85

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON LIBRARY:
SUMMARY OF FACULTY EVALUATION PROCEDURES

INTRODUCTION

The following summary of Library Faculty personnel evaluation processes has been prepared as a guide to current interpretation of Library and University policies concerning annual evaluation, contract renewal, promotion, and post-tenure review. Members of the Library faculty are advised to review this document upon appointment and when compiling evaluation materials. Questions regarding evaluation processes may be referred to the Personnel Librarian, the University Librarian, or the Vice-Provost for Academic Personnel.
For additional information, please refer to the following authoritative and historical documents, which are available in Library Personnel (Administrative Rules and UO Policy Statements are also available in the Reference Department):

1. Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) Chapter 580 (Board of Higher Education. See especially Division 21, "Conditions of Service."

2. OAR Chapter 571 (University of Oregon). See especially Division 3, "Grievance Procedures" and Division 30, "Faculty Records."

3. UO Policy Statements. See especially 3.100, "Academic Personnel" and 3.400, "Administrative Personnel."

4. UO Faculty Handbook (issued biennially).

5. Library Faculty Bylaws (most recent edition).

6. Report of the findings and recommendations of the Library Academic Personnel Committee to the University Librarian ("Jones Committee Report"), September, 1980. This extensive report contains a history of library faculty status at the UO, summaries of discussions leading toward the implementation of administrative faculty status for UO librarians, and a series of recommendations for future appointment and evaluation procedures. See also George Shipman's response to the report, dated October 31, 1980.

7. Correspondence relating UO Policy Statement 3.400, including the "Hawk Committee Report" of November 18, 1982 and George Shipman's response of December 2, 1982.

A general note about personnel files: Departmental personnel files are housed in Library Personnel. Official institutional files are housed in the Office of Management and Budget, and are essentially limited to appointment and promotion/tenure records. Faculty members are reminded that they are allowed full access to their own personnel files and personal records kept by the Library and the University,

with confidential materials submitted before July 1, 1975 being excepted. Other materials may also be confidential: examples include placement service letters and promotion or review documents to which the faculty member has waived rights of access. Even when access has been waived, a faculty member may request a summary which does not disclose the authorship of confidential documents. (See OAR 580-22-100).

ANNUAL EVALUATION

The goal of the annual evaluation process is to assess and measure the performance of Library faculty. This process requires direct involvement of the faculty member, supervising department head, and administrators. Annual evaluations are the essential record of long-term performance and are among the primary documents considered during contract renewal, promotion, and post-tenure reviews. Numerical ratings assigned as part of the annual evaluation are used to determine the amount of merit pay increase, when such increases are provided.

TIMETABLES

The period of performance being evaluated is April 1st to March 31st. Evaluation reports are submitted and meetings are held between April 1 and June 30 in order to allow submission of salary increase recommendations prior to the beginning of the new fiscal year.

NOTIFICATION PROCEDURES

Letters describing the annual evaluation process and stating deadlines for submission of materials are sent to all faculty near the end of the review period.

DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED

The faculty member provides his or her supervisor with two documents:

1. the "Report by Faculty Member", with relevant areas of activity indicated, and

2. a narrative explanation correlated with the "Report by Faculty Member." The discussion of "Quality of Professional Performance" must be clearly correlated to the most current set of "Evaluating Criteria for Librarians".

The immediate supervisor provides the "Annual Faculty Evaluation Rating", completed after review of the faculty member's personnel file and "Report." A narrative appraisal is to be included in this document.

EVALUATION MEETINGS

Library faculty have individual meetings with their immediate supervisor to discuss the evaluation documents and ratings given. This is a good time to discuss future goals and plans. The faculty member is given an opportunity to sign the evaluation document, indicating either concurrence or disagreement with the ratings given. If the faculty member wishes to comment on the evaluation, a supplement should be attached to the document prior to its forwarding to the next level of review. Subsequent meetings are held with the relevant Assistant University Librarian and University Librarian; initial ratings may be changed at any level.

APPEALS

As described above, the annual review process is designed to permit appeal of an evaluation at each level of administrative review. Evidence to support the appeal should be attached to the evaluation document prior to its forwarding to the next level of review. If a faculty member wishes to challenge the final rating, he or she may grieve the decision according to the procedures defined in OAR Chapter 571, Division 3. Prior consultation with the Library Faculty Personnel Committee, Personnel Librarian, or University Librarian is suggested.

CONTRACT RENEWAL (INCLUDING "SIXTH YEAR REVIEW")

Untenured librarians are reviewed during the final year of their current contract for purposes of contract renewal. Such reviews are conducted according to procedures defined in the University of Oregon Faculty Handbook, UO Policy Statement 3.400, and OAR Chapter 580, Division 21. The "sixth-year review" is an expanded contract renewal review which a) includes solicitation of letters from references outside the Library, b) is frequently conducted concurrent with a promotion review, and c) if successfully completed, generates three-year fixed term contracts (as opposed to additional two-year contracts). Criteria used in contract renewal reviews are the same used in the annual evaluation.

TIMETABLES

The following timetables should be considered typical. There will be exceptions resulting from factors such as reduced FTE or credit given for previous experience in other institutions.

Entry level

An entry-level librarian will normally be awarded a series of three successive two-year contracts. In the second year of each contract period, a review will be conducted for purposes of contract renewal. The third such review will

constitute the sixth year review. Following successful passage of the sixth year review, the faculty member will be awarded three-year contracts.

Limited seniority

Some librarians with previous professional experience may be appointed on initial 2-year contracts but with possible credit toward the six-year limit. This credit amount will typically be determined by the faculty member, the University Librarian, and the Provost when the initial offer is being negotiated. Determining factors might include but are not necessarily limited to:

1. length of service in other institutions,

2. rank held in previous appointments,

3. type of institutions in which prior experience was gained,

4. presence of graduate degrees other than the MLS or other required degrees,

5. qualitative assessment of exceptional potential for long-term success in the appointment being offered.

In such cases, the "sixth year" contract renewal review would be conducted at an earlier date.

Senior positions

Department Heads and senior administrative librarians are usually appointed on an initial three-year contract. Because faculty appointed to these positions usually have more than six years professional experience and have often achieved tenure or have passed some other form of "up-or-out" review in another institution, the six-year rule will not normally be applied to these faculty members. They will be reviewed for purposes of regular contract renewal in the final year of each contract period.

NOTIFICATION PROCEDURES

Faculty members to be reviewed for purposes of contract renewal will be notified by letter from the University Librarian. These letters will normally be mailed in the summer or early fall in order to allow ample time for preparation and review of the case file.

DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED

NOTE: Documentation for the "six-year review" duplicates that compiled for a promotion review (see below).

For purposes of contract renewal, the following materials will be solicited by the University Librarian, compiled by the Personnel Librarian, and reviewed by the Library Faculty Personnel Committee:

1. Personal Statement describing accomplishments since last contract renewal or, if still in the first contract period, since initial appointment.

2. Annual evaluations since last contract renewal or, if still in the first contract period, since initial appointment.

3. Updates of annual evaluations from:
   a. supervising Department Head
   b. Assistant University Librarian with administrative jurisdiction

Additional materials from faculty and staff outside the line of supervision may be requested if supervisors and/or the Library Faculty Personnel Committee require such information to conduct their review. Such materials might include but are not necessarily limited to:

1. Letters from Library faculty outside the direct line of supervision with whom the faculty member has worked closely during the review period.

2. Deans, department heads, faculty members, administrators, or other members of the University community with whom the faculty member has worked closely during the review period.

3. OSSHE staff or other State officials with whom the faculty member has worked closely during the review period.

4. Relevant experts outside the University or State System who can testify regarding the nature and quality of the faculty member's professional performance and/or contribution to their discipline.

These materials must be solicited by the University Librarian. The faculty member under review will be informed by the University Librarian when any such materials are requested.

The Committee will also examine unsolicited comments which have been placed in the faculty member's personnel file during the

review period. Faculty members are to be informed when such materials enter their files.

REVIEWERS

The completed dossier is reviewed by:

1. the Library Faculty Personnel Committee, which drafts a recommendation for or against renewal,

2. the University Librarian, who endorses or refutes the Library Faculty Personnel Committee's recommendation, and

3. the Provost.

When the review process is completed, the faculty member will receive a letter from the Provost. These letters are normally mailed sometime before June 30. In a successful case, the Provost typically extends an offer of a fixed-term appointment of a length suggested by the University Librarian. In an unsuccessful case, the Provost will extend a non-renewable contract of a length sufficient to provide timely notice (see below).

Faculty members are notified when their case has passed from the Library Faculty Personnel Committee to the University Librarian. The University Librarian or designee will meet with faculty members to review the file before it is forwarded to the Provost. Faculty members should keep in mind that review files are part of their permanent personnel record and that they have rights of access to their contents (or, if they have waived rights of access, to a summary of the contents) at any time.

TIMELY NOTICE

If a contract is not renewed for reasons other than cause or financial exigency, timely notice of termination will be given as follows:

1. At least three months before termination for a faculty member in the first year of a fixed-term appointment;

1. At least six months before termination for a faculty member in the second year of a fixed-term appointment (years of service must be consecutive);

2. At least 12 months before termination for a faculty member in the third or subsequent year of fixed-term appointments (years of service must be consecutive).

APPEALS

If a six-year committee review results in terminal notice, the faculty member may submit an appeal based on alleged procedural or substantive error to the Provost. The Provost will review the appeal with the help of the University Librarian or designee. (See UO Policy Statement 3.400; OAR Chapter 580-21-305).

NOTE: "The non-renewal of an appointment in other than promotion and tenure cases as set forth in OAR 571-03-015 and 571-03-016 shall not be subject to the hearing processes of [the] grievance procedure [for academic employees]." (OAR 571-03-017)

PROMOTIONS

Members of the Library faculty hold academic rank as Officers of Administration (some Library faculty appointed before 1981 are Officers of Instruction). Criteria used in evaluating Library faculty for promotion in rank are the same as those used for contract renewal and annual evaluation reviews. Officers of Instruction are also required to meet criteria for original research and publication as applied to members of the teaching faculties.

TIMETABLES

Unlike reviews for contract renewal, promotion reviews are conducted at the option of the individual faculty member. It should be pointed out that although a faculty member can seek promotion at any time, early promotions (based on anything but years-in-rank) are considered very exceptional and normally require departmental initiation. It is suggested that faculty members considering any promotion option discuss their plans beforehand with relevant supervisors and administrators, the Personnel Librarian, members of the Library Faculty Personnel Committee, and University Personnel Committee (Officers of Instruction only).

Entry level

An entry-level librarian will normally be appointed with the rank of Assistant Professor. Individuals appointed to faculty positions which do not require a Master's-level degree may be appointed as Instructors, Research Associates, or Research Assistants. Final determination of academic rank is subject to the approval of the Provost and the Office of Affirmative Action.

The first promotion review for an entry-level librarian would be conducted after completion of the fifth year of

appointment (the "six-year limit").* After the faculty member is promoted and serves five years in the new rank, notification of the promotion option will be provided every year until the option is exercised again.

Limited seniority

Some librarians with previous experience may be appointed as Assistant Professors but with "credit" toward the six-year limit. This credit amount will normally be determined by the faculty member, the University Librarian, and the Provost while the initial offer is being negotiated. In most such cases, the option for early promotion review would be written into the Offer of Academic Appointment. Determining factors might include but are not necessarily limited to:

1. length of service in other institutions,

2. rank held in previous appointments,

3. type of institutions in which prior experience was gained,

4. presence of graduate degrees other than the MLS or other required degrees.

After a faculty member is promoted and serves five years in the new rank, notification of the promotion option will be provided every year until the option is exercised again.*

Senior positions

Department Heads and senior administrative librarians are usually appointed on an initial three-year contracts with the rank of Associate Professor and are eligible for promotion after five years in rank. Appointment to the rank of Professor is possible in some cases. For Associate Professors, after the fifth year in rank, notification of the promotion option will be provided every year until the option is exercised.*

* Anniversary dates for purposes of promotion are rounded to the nearest July 1. Example: a new library school graduate appointed in December, 1986 would be reviewed for promotion during the 1991-92 fiscal year with promotion effective July 1, 1992. A librarian appointed in January, 1987 would not be reviewed until 1992-93.
* Anniversary dates for purposes of promotion are rounded to the nearest July 1.

NOTIFICATION PROCEDURES

Faculty members eligible for promotion will be notified by letter from the University Librarian. These letters will normally be mailed in the summer or early fall in order to allow ample time for preparation and review of the promotion dossier.

DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED

It is the responsibility of the University Librarian to compile the promotion dossier to be forwarded to the Provost. Faculty members who wish to be reviewed, though, must provide the following documents:

1. Notice of intent to be considered for promotion.

2. Waiver option. Because the promotion review process requires solicitation of letters from references outside the University of Oregon Library, faculty members are provided with various options regarding the confidentiality of these references:

   a. Waiver of all access to the dossier, including the recommendation of the Library Faculty Personnel Committee. This option allows committee reports to quote freely from reference letters even when letters have been forwarded in confidence. Such a waiver does not preclude the faculty member from requesting a summary of the file materials, including letters of reference, which does not allow the authors to be identified.

   b. Waiver of access to referee's letters only. This option keeps letters from outside referees confidential but allows the faculty member access to evaluative materials provided by supervisors and to committee recommendations. The faculty member may request a summary of the reference letters which does not allow the authors to be identified.

   c. Retention of full right of access to the dossier, including letters of outside references.

3. A list of the names and current addresses of references. There should be no fewer than three and, in most cases, no more than eight names provided.

4. A personal statement describing accomplishments since last promoted or since initial appointment.

5. A current resume or curriculum vita.

In addition to the outside references, the University Librarian will request updates of the annual evaluation from the supervising Department Head and Assistant University Librarian with administrative jurisdiction.

Additional materials from faculty and staff outside the line of supervision may be requested if reviewers require such information. Such materials might include but are not necessarily limited to:

1. Letters from Library faculty outside the direct line of supervision with whom the faculty member has worked closely during the review period.

2. Deans, department heads, faculty members, administrators, or other members of the University community with whom the faculty member has worked closely during the review period.

3. OSSHE staff or other State officials with whom the faculty member has worked closely during the review period.

4. Relevant experts outside the University or State System who can testify regarding the nature and quality of the faculty member's professional performance and/or contribution to their discipline.

These materials must be solicited by the University Librarian, University Faculty Personnel Committee (Officers of Instruction only), or the Provost. The faculty member under review will be informed when such materials are requested.

Reviewers will also consider unsolicited comments which have been placed in the faculty member's personnel file during the review period. Faculty members are to be informed when such materials are placed in their files.

REVIEWERS

The completed dossier is reviewed by:

1. the Library Faculty Personnel Committee, which drafts a recommendation for or against promotion,

2. the University Librarian, who endorses or refutes the Library Faculty Personnel Committee's recommendation,

3. The University Faculty Personnel Committee (Officers of Instruction only), and

4. the Provost.

Faculty members are notified when their case has passed from the Library Faculty Personnel Committee to the University Librarian.

The University Librarian or designee will meet with faculty members to review the file before it is forwarded to the University Faculty Personnel Committee or Provost. Faculty members should keep in mind that review files are part of their permanent personnel record and that they have rights of access to their contents (or, if they have waived rights of access, to a summary of the contents) at any time.

APPEALS

Barring evidence of illegal discrimination in a promotion case (OAR 571-03-010), grievance resolution procedures of the University are limited to "challenges to procedural accuracy ar assertions of arbitrary and capricious conduct in the exercise of academic, peer, or administrative judgment in decisions concerning [promotion]. Requests for further consideration of a disputed promotion case shall be made in writing to the Provost." (OAR 571-03-016)

POST-TENURE REVIEW

Those members of the Library Faculty who achieved tenure as Officers of Instruction prior to 1981 are reviewed every five years for purposes of post-tenure review. The procedure for post-tenure review relates closely to the regular review process for faculty. Objectives of post-tenure review are to encourage, to reward, and to support the continuous development of faculty members and, through the process of peer review, to identify tenured faculty members who merit special recognition or who need special assistance.

As mentioned above, post-tenure reviews are required at least every five years. Earlier reviews may be requested by the faculty member, the department head, or the University Librarian; requests for early review shall be in writing and shall include reasons for early consideration. Any review for promotion shall be substituted for the post-tenure review. In addition, a tenured member of the faculty or administration may request, in lieu of the post-tenure review, a special review by the University Personnel Committee conducted through the regular review process.*

* University policy precludes deans and department heads from serving on post-tenure review committees. Also, these committees must contain at least three tenured faculty members. Because these criteria differ from those used to determine eligibility for service on the Library Faculty Personnel Committee, a separate Post-tenure Review Committee has been established. (References: Library Faculty Bylaws, Article VII, Section VII; UO Policy Statement 3.150).

Documentation for the post-tenure review consists of:

1. A statement by the faculty member of scholarly, scientific, professional or artistic accomplishments, goals, and plans.

2. An up-to-date vita and bibliography.

3. Annual evaluations since the last review.

Additional materials may be requested if the Post-tenure Review Committee or University Librarian require such information to conduct the review. Such materials might include but are not necessarily limited to:

1. Statements from supervising Library department heads or administrators summarizing the past duties and responsibilities of the faculty member, including pertinent information concerning the conditions of appointment.

2. Summaries of student evaluations, if the faculty member has had classroom teaching responsibilities.

3. Letters from:

   a. Library faculty outside the direct line of supervision with whom the faculty member has worked closely during the review period.

   b. Deans, department heads, faculty members, administrators, or other members of the University community with whom the faculty member has worked closely during the review period.

   c. OSSHE staff or other State officials with whom the faculty member has worked closely during the review period.

   d. Relevant experts outside the University or State System who can testify regarding the nature and quality of the faculty member's professional performance and/or contribution to their discipline.

4. Supportive documents such as copies of publications, manuscripts, reviews, etc.

These materials must be solicited by the University Librarian. The faculty member under review will be informed by the University Librarian when any such materials are requested.

The post-tenure review is conducted by the Post-tenure Review Committee. The Committee will summarize its review in a report which is forwarded to the faculty member, the University Librarian, and the Provost. Faculty members are notified when

their case has passed from the Library Faculty Personnel Committee to the University Librarian. The University Librarian or designee will meet with faculty members to review the file before it is forwarded to the Provost. Faculty members should keep in mind that post-tenure review files are part of their permanent personnel record and that they have rights of access to their contents at any time.

Please refer to OAR 580-21-140 and UO Policy Statement 3.150 for further information.

ARB
87/01/27

UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

ANNUAL FACULTY PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL PROCEDURES

1. On June 1, the Director of Libraries should initiate the annual review by: issuing a review schedule, reminding the "activity supervisors" and committee chairs to submit written comments to line supervisors, and instructing the Personnel Office to distribute to all faculty their job descriptions, their most recent Annual Activities Report (Form A), and the new performance appraisal form.

2. Librarians should review their job descriptions and add new information to the Annual Activities Report. This information should be submitted to the line Supervisors within three weeks after the form distribution.

3. Activity supervisors and major committee/taskforce chairpersons should consider individuals who have worked a significant number of hours in their area or who have made a significant contribution and should submit a short written report to the direct supervisor within three weeks after the form distribution.

4. The Department Heads/Supervisors should review the job description, written input by "activity supervisors", and the individual's Annual Activities Report. Based on these documents and personal observation, the supervisors should prepare the annual review. It should include comments on the activities of the past year and should indicate areas for improvement or emphasis.

5. Department Heads should review this draft evaluation with their reporting supervisors. The reporting supervisors should make certain that the form includes developmental suggestions and may suggest goals or areas for emphasis.

6. By August 1, supervisors should give each faculty member the written evaluation and any written comments from activity supervisors and should set a time for a review meeting. If there are questions about activity supervisor comments, this supervisor should be contacted before the official Performance Review Meeting.

7. Individual faculty members should work with their activity supervisors in identifying possible goals in each area of responsibility and should bring this list to the Performance Review Meeting.

8. The Performance Review Meeting should include a review of the evaluation, a discussion of the individual's progress and needs, and the development of a realistic set of goals for the coming year.

9. Following the Performance Review Meeting, the individual should prepare Form C, submit any general comments on the evaluation or the work situation on Form D, and sign the appropriate forms. The supervisor should review and sign the completed packet and set dates for the Goal Review meetings. The Supervisor should submit the completed packet to the appropriate supervisor by August 15 and should give a copy of the complete packet to the individual librarian for his/her own files.

10. It is the responsibility of the Department Head or Supervisor to make certain that all forms are completed and submitted by August 15.

Prepared by the Faculty
Affairs Committee

Charlotte Ames
Jo Bessler
Alan Krieger
Kathryn Ryan-Zeugner, Chair

February 1986
Revised April 1986

Northwestern University Library

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROCESS

1. Library professional's written report and draft goals to supervisor.

2. Supervisor appraises performance and gives to library professional.

3. Library professional and supervisor discuss evaluation and finalize statement on goals for upcoming year. Supervisor prepares in final form and attaches it to the documents cited in steps 1 and 2 and returns to library professional for possible response.

4. Library professional's comments to supervisor or, if no comments, to Section and/or Department Head.

5. Section/Department Head comments (if any) to Division Head.

6. Division Head comments (if any), signs and routes to Department/Section Head, Supervisor, and library professional for signatures.

7. Completed documents to Director of Library Research, Analysis and Personnel (DLRAP)

8. DLRAP submits document to University Librarian.

9. University Librarian returns documents to DLRAP.

STAFF MEMBER COPY

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

MIT LIBRARIES PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM
FOR LIBRARIANS AND OTHER ACADEMIC STAFF

1. Objectives

   a. To improve the effectiveness of the MIT Libraries in achieving its goals through the continual development of individual staff members;
   b. Help staff members to grow and improve in their present job assignments, in self-development, and in setting appropriate goals for future growth.
   c. Provide staff members with an assessment of the quality of their performance.
   d. Assist in the determination of salary recommendations.
   e. Strengthen communication and understanding between staff members and their supervisors.
   f. Contribute to the identification of candidates for promotion.

2. Responsibility for Administration

   The performance review system and procedures will be administered by the Assistant Director for Administration in consultation with Steering Committee and others as appropriate. The system will be continuously reviewed, assessed, and updated.

3. Reporting Period

   a. All newly-appointed staff members, including staff members appointed to new positions, will be evaluated on the six-month anniversary of appointment.
   b. A performance evaluation of librarians and other academic staff will be conducted annually on the anniversary of the six month evaluation.

4. Participants

   a. Ordinarily, staff members will be evaluated by their immediate supervisors. In some situations, the staff member may be evaluated, at their request, by more than one supervisor, for example, the immediate supervisor and department head.

   b. Some staff members may, while administratively reporting to only one person, be responsible to different persons for different aspects of their responsibilities. It is essential in those cases that the evaluator seek input on performance from all appropriate persons before the evaluation. It is recommended that an actual evaluation of the staff member take place with each person who has a supervisory role.

   c. In a few cases it is mandated by library policy that multiple evaluations take place (e.g. collection managers are to be evaluated both by the Assistant Director for Collection Management and Technical Services and by the immediate supervisor in the divisional library.)

5. Form

   a. The performance evaluation may be written or oral, at the option of the staff members being reviewed or the option of the supervisor except as follows:
      i. Newly-appointed staff members must have written evaluations at the six-month anniversary of appointment.
      ii. A Librarian I must have written evaluations until promotion to Librarian II has occurred.
      iii. All staff members must have written evaluations at least once every three years unless exempted by their Assistant Director (in the case of staff members in the Institute Archives and in the MIT Museum, by the Director).

   b. The forms used will be prepared by the Assistant Director for Administration in consultation with others as appropriate; the forms are subject to change and modification to reflect experience with the process. The following forms are currently in use (samples are attached):

Part I	Review of Accomplishments	(staff member)
Part II	Goal-Setting Statement	(staff member)
Part III	Performance Evaluation	(supervisor)
Part IV	Goal Setting Statement	(supervisor)
Part IV	Interview Summary Sheet	(staff member and supervisor)

6. Record Keeping

   a. Written performance evaluations will be retained in the Director's Office for three years. Supervisors will not keep copies for their files. At the request of staff members, the written evaluations may be made a part of their permanent personnel files. Supervisors are encouraged to keep a copy of the summary statement of goals agreed upon in the evaluation.

   b. Access to written evaluations is limited to the individual, the immediate supervisor and/or department heads, and Steering Committee members.

7. Procedure

   a. The forms and explanatory memoranda will be prepared by the Assistant Director for Administration and distributed to Department Heads by the end of the month preceding the scheduled evaluation. Department Heads will distribute them to the staff member(s) to be evaluated.

b. The supervisor and staff member will discuss as soon as possible the nature of the evaluation (i.e. oral or written). Staff members seeking exemption from the mandatory three-year written evaluation should address a request in writing to their Assistant Director (in the case of Institute Archives and MIT Museum staff members, to the Director) stating the reason for the request.

c. Interviews will be scheduled by the supervisor; it is suggested that at least an hour for each interview be allowed.

d. Each staff member and supervisor completes forms or prepares for oral discussion. Written forms are exchanged the day before a scheduled interview.

e. Oral interview will be held during which supervisor and staff member discuss past performance and negotiate goals; goals agreed upon are to be summarized on the interview summary sheet which both supervisor and staff member then sign.

f. All forms will be forwarded by the Department Head to the Assistant Director for Administration by the end of the scheduled month for evaluation.

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

FACULTY EVALUATION PROCEDURES

LIBRARY FACULTY ASSOCIATION
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
1985/86

E. Anne Edwards (Chair)
John C. Cosgriff
Anita I. Malebranche
Marilyn L. Norstedt
Bruce Obenhaus
Frances O. Painter

INTRODUCTION

The annual evaluation process is intended to reflect the accomplishments and professional goals of every librarian. With the exception of the Director of Libraries, each librarian is required to prepare an activity report and be evaluated by his/her supervisor. Because it is expected that a continuous dialogue on the librarian's progress will take place throughout the evaluation period, the activity report and evaluation should not contain any surprises. The authors of the reports are responsible for the accuracy of the grammar, spelling, and typing.

The evaluation should be completely candid, and will not be shared with anyone other than the librarian and his/her supervisors. The document will not be considered part of the Promotion and Continued Appointment process, but will be used in the determination of salary.

EVALUATION OF NEW LIBRARIANS OR THOSE IN NEW POSITIONS

Newly hired librarians and librarians who have transferred into new positions within the library system will be evaluated after six months, and thereafter at the end of each calendar year. The librarian's supervisor is responsible for setting goals for the first six months, and discussing these with the librarian. The first six months are not considered probationary, but discussion after this time period provides an opportunity for the librarian and supervisor to review the librarian's progress and set further goals. (If the date on which the evaluation is due falls at the end of the calendar year, the evaluator will discuss the timetable with the Assistant to the Director for Personnel.)

UPWARD EVALUATION

The Director, assistant directors, and department heads will be evaluated every two years in late August and September on a staggered schedule.

The Director will be evaluated by all librarians and members of the Library Administrative Committee. Assistant directors, including those in acting positions, will be evaluated by their department heads, section heads, and librarians, except in those instances where less than six people will be completing the evaluation. In those cases, all librarians and staff in the departments for which the assistant director is responsible will be invited to participate. Department heads will be evaluated by their librarians and staff.

The Assistant to the Director for Personnel will distribute and later collect the evaluations, and will forward them to the supervisor of the individual being evaluated. The supervisor will compile the comments into a summary report, without revealing the sources, and will share the information with the individual. One copy of the report will be given to the individual, a second will be filed in his/her personnel file, and the original evaluations will be shredded in the Personnel Office. The Assistant to the Director for Personnel is responsible for coordinating and monitoring the process.

TIMETABLE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION

Late October

Each librarian will receive a complete calendar for the evaluation process and a copy of his/her current job description from the Personnel Office.

First working day in November through the last working day of December:

The librarian and his/her evaluator review the librarian's current job description. The job description should outline the responsibilities of the position, and should not describe the incumbent's strengths or talents. If changes are made, the revised job description must be forwarded to the Personnel Office for final review.

First working day in January through the last working day in February:

The librarian completes an activity report covering the previous calendar year, signs it, and forwards it to his/her evaluator by the date specified by the evaluator.

The evaluator completes the written evaluation and discusses it with his/her supervisors (including the appropriate assistant director), before signing it. The evaluator then makes an appointment with the librarian to discuss the activity report and the evaluation, and gives a copy of the signed evaluation to the librarian at least three working days before the meeting.

After reading his/her evaluation, the librarian may comment, in writing, on a separate sheet. Any discussion pertaining to these comments should take place before the end of February, and the written comments must be attached to the activity report and evaluation. Any librarian may schedule a meeting with his/her evaluator's supervisor and/or assistant director to discuss the evaluation or any other matter.

The signed activity report and evaluation, together with any other necessary documentation, are forwarded to the Personnel Office, where they are filed in the librarian's personnel file.

THE ACTIVITY REPORT

The report will begin with a heading, to include:

Name
Rank
Position title
Department/Section
Time period covered by report

The librarian will base the report on his/her job description and will comment on the quality of his/her performance during the previous calendar year, using the categories described below. Those categories in which the librarian was not active should be omitted.

1. Accomplishments:

   - Procedural innovations and improvements for which the librarian was responsible.
   - Noteworthy supervisory skills and accomplishments.
   - Other assigned duties and responsibilities.

2. Professional activity:

   - In-house publications of substance.
   - Research projects, publications, and conference participation.
   - Conferences, seminars, and workshops attended, libraries visited, courses taught, continuing education courses taken, etc., and the significance of such to the position.
   - Participation on national, regional, university, and library committees, offices held, papers presented, etc.

3. Goals:

   - Previously set goals that were or were not met during the previous year.

   - New self-set goals and deadlines.

4. Planning:

   - Suggestions for improving the work environment, including physical working conditions, working relationships, clerical support, interdepartmental organization, improvement of staff morale, etc.

   - Any areas of responsibility in which additional assistance, guidance, or training are needed

THE EVALUATION

Evaluators will use the librarian's activity report as a basis for the evaluation, bearing in mind the following criteria:

1. Primary job assignment

   a. Performance of duties, working independently and with initiative.

      1) General knowledge of the profession, its trends and issues, and a demonstrated effectiveness in applying this knowledge to bibliographic techniques, organization, interpretation of the collection, etc., to meet the needs of patrons and library staff.

      2) Understanding of the various policies, procedures, and service of the University Libraries, and a demonstrated ability to serve the library clientele through interpretation of these policies and procedures.

      3) Knowledge of the specifics of a particular job and demonstration of skill in performing that job, including judgement and decision-making abilities, quality of completed work assignments, the ability to set and accomplish appropriate performance goals, etc.

   b. Demonstration of supervisory ability. (This applies only if a librarian is in a supervisory position.)

1) Effectiveness in the administration and supervision of a department or section of the University Libraries.

2) Ability to train, coordinate, supervise, and evaluate personnel, and assist and delegate work in the performance of specific functions essential to the operations of the University Libraries.

c. Ability to establish and maintain effective work relationships with colleagues and patrons, and to cooperate with members of his/her department and with other departments.

2. Research and Scholarship

a. Professional recognition as evidenced by awards, grants, consultantships, etc.

b. Research as evidenced by publication. This may include substantial in-house publications as well as outside publications.

c. Professional growth and development through attendance at work-related seminars and workshops, enrollment in, and completion of, continuing education courses, pursuit of additional degrees, etc.

3. Service

a. Participation in national, regional, state, and local professional associations as demonstrated by activities such as holding office, service on committees, presentation of papers, service on panels, and attendance at conferences and conventions.

b. Service on University committees, commissions, etc.

c. Service on committees of the University Libraries.

d. Teaching, other than as part of the librarian's primary assignment. This may include teaching within the University Libraries, such as leading seminars, giving orientation programs, etc.

e. Other.

COMPLETION OF THE DOCUMENT

A final page (see Appendix A) must be added to the activity report, evaluation, and any further written comments to complete the document before it is filed in the librarian's personnel file. This page carries the final signatures of the librarian, the evaluator, the evaluator's supervisors to the appropriate assistant director, and the Director of Libraries.

APPENDIX A

My signature does not indicate that I agree or disagree with this evaluation, simply that it was discussed with me and opportunity was available for my comments. I understand that I may submit a written response, if I wish.

Librarian_____ Date_____

We have seen and discussed this evaluation.

Evaluator_____ Date_____

Reporting Line_____ Date_____

Reporting Line_____ Date_____

Reporting Line_____ Date_____

Assistant Director_____ Date_____

Director of Libraries_____ Date_____

Peer Review

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

VISITING COMMITTEE PROCEDURES: EVALUATION OF JOB PERFORMANCE OF DEPARTMENTAL LIBRARY SERVICES FACULTY

Evaluation procedures have been developed to provide objective peer review of tenure-track faculty. Information is sought largely through personal or telephone interviews with faculty, students, other library clients, and professional colleagues, in the course of which comments are solicited which may facilitate promotion and/or the achievement of tenure by faculty who are undergoing evaluation. The procedure provides for obtaining detailed information on various specific areas of responsibility, as well as evaluating job performance in general terms. The process is personally supportive, and provides opportunities for informal discussion and for forwarding positive comments as well as recommendations for improving job performance. While untenured faculty are encouraged to seek advice from their visiting committees as to matters concerning publication or professional service, so that they might benefit from the experience of faculty colleagues who have already achieved tenure, the sole purpose of the written evaluation reports is to provide documentation pertinent to job performance.

Composition of Committee

For each untenured faculty member of Departmental Library Services and each tenured faculty member seeking promotion within the following academic year, two tenured members of the faculty are asked by the Director to serve as a visiting evaluation committee. Ideally, such a committee includes at least one person from the council to which the candidate's library is affiliated. The committee never includes a faculty member from the same library unit in which the candidate undergoing review is employed, nor is input sought from individuals who work under the direct supervision of the candidate under evaluation. It is normally expected that the composition of the committee will remain the same (barring resignation, retirement, sabbaticals, etc.) until a decision has been made regarding tenure or promotion; i.e., a committee established when a candidate is 1Y will serve six years. After each evaluation, however, a candidate has the option of requesting the appointment of a different committee for subsequent evaluations.

Frequency of Evaluation

Untenured candidates are evaluated every spring semester, after completion of at least one full semester of employment; typically, five or six annual evaluation documents are thereby prepared for each candidate prior to the submission of tenure/promotion applications in the sixth year of employment. Tenured individuals seeking advancement to associate or full professor are evaluated once only, during the spring semester immediately prior to submission of their promotion applications.

Chronology of Formal Evaluation

1) Committee is appointed by director (with recommendations from advisory committee); pre-existing committees receive reminder with deadlines. (See below.)

2) Committee members are provided with appropriate documentation. (See p. 3.)

3) Committee meets with candidate to review procedures and select specific areas to evaluate. (See p. 3.)

4) Committee meets with unit head (for evaluation of assistant librarians) or assistant director (for evaluation of unit heads). (See p. 4.)

5) Committee may meet with executive officer(s) of academic department(s) or college served by candidate's library, or with chair of departmental library committee (required for unit heads; optional for assistant librarians). (See p. 5.)

6) Each committee member interviews individuals selected from lists developed by unit head/assistant director in consultation with candidate, until required number of interviews have been completed. (See p. 6.)

7) Committee members meet to compare information collected via interviews, and to complete evaluation form. Copy of evaluation form is sent to candidate, along with supplemental form for his/her signature and written comments. (See p. 6.)

8) Committee meets with candidate to discuss evaluation (See p. 7.)

9) Evaluation form and supplemental form forwarded to Director of Departmental Library Services; copies sent to unit head or Assistant Director. (See p. 7.)

In the meetings cited above, any or all aspects of a candidate's job performance may be brought up for examination. Each step is outlined in greater detail below.

1) Committee is appointed by director with recommendations from advisory committee: pre-existing committees receive reminder with deadlines.

At this point, it may be useful for committee members to establish a schedule for completing specific stages of the evaluation process, and to decide how various responsibilities might be assigned (e.g., setting up appointments, maintaining files, taking notes and/or producing written summaries of formal interviews, etc.).

2) Committee members are provided with appropriate documentation:

a) candidate's current vita (submitted by candidate).

b) brief (i.e., one-page) description of candidate's job responsibilities, together with approximate percentage of time allotted to each category of responsibility (submitted by candidate).

c) personal annual reports (as available for past three years; forwarded from DLS office).

d) all previous committee evaluations (forwarded from the DLS office, as required).

Committee members must confirm that all appropriate documentation has been received prior to the initial interview with the candidate.

3) Committee meets with candidate to review procedures and select specific areas to evaluate.

During this, the first of two scheduled meetings with the candidate, the evaluation committee is expected to:

a) Review procedures and discuss significance of formal evaluation.

b) Review candidate's job responsibilities. (If evaluators are unfamiliar with the departmental library, candidate may conduct an informal tour and/or demonstrate procedures, etc.: this step is primarily for the benefit of the evaluators.

c) Choose three or fewer specific areas for detailed evaluation, from the following list:

Areas of Evaluation:	Evaluative Comments May be Solicited from:
*1) Information services (including reference, online services, and bibliographic instruction [excluding formal courses])	Library clients; unit head or Assistant Director; departmental faculty
*2) Collection development (selection of books, journals, and other materials; collection evaluation; etc.)	Library clients; unit head or Assistant Director; departmental faculty; departmental library committee chair

3) Management/administration	Unit head or Assistant Director; executive officer(s) of academic department(s) or college; departmental library committee chair
4) Cataloging/bibliographic control (including non-traditional approaches)	Unit head or Assistant Director; council cataloging coordinator; principal cataloger
5) Special projects and/or other assignments	Unit head or Assistant Director; appropriate individuals
6) Library/University service	Unit head or Assistant Director; other appropriate individuals

Evaluative comments will be solicited via informal interviews conducted by telephone or in personal meetings (or via written evaluation, at the option of individuals being interviewed). At least four individuals are to be contacted regarding areas of evaluation indicated by asterisks, which are activities in which large numbers of library clients are served; at least two individuals are interviewed for any of the other areas. If appropriate, input may be solicited from the same individual for more than one area of evaluation.

Individuals to be interviewed are selected by committee members from lists developed by the assistant director or unit head of the candidate's library in consultation with the candidate; it is suggested that six names be provided for areas requiring at least four interviews, and two to four names for any other area of evaluation.

Areas to be evaluated may stay the same or vary between evaluations reflecting changes in responsibility, percentage of time allocated to specific duties, and/or the advisability of obtaining evaluation in a variety of areas.

Candidate should be reminded that the unit head or assistant director will approach him/her for assistance in formulating lists of potential interviewees for these specific areas.

4) Committee meets with unit head (for evaluation of assistant librarians) or assistant director (for evaluation of unit heads).

The purpose of this interview is to discuss candidate's job performance generally, to develop lists of individuals to interview regarding specific areas of responsibility, and to conduct formal interviews regarding any specific areas in which the unit head or assistant director is considered an appropriate individual from whom to solicit evaluative comments. At the time an appointment is made, the unit head or assistant director should be reminded to discuss with the candidate the names of potential interviewees.

A possible agenda for this meeting is as follows:

a) Review procedures

b) Establish lists of interviewees (ascertain if candidate has been contacted). In the case of untenured faculty, unit heads/assistant directors should be encouraged to vary the names on the list of potential interviewees from one evaluation to another, so that by the time a candidate comes up for tenure information has been solicited from a wide variety of respondents.

c) Discuss unit head/assistant director's perception of candidate's job performance generally, in respect to the following factors (or any other areas which either the unit head/assistant director of members of the evaluation committee wish to address):

- professional competency and creativity
- overall relationship with library personnel and clientele
- commitment to the library profession
- communication skills, as reflected in interaction with co-workers and library users

(If significant reservations are expressed about any area of job performance, visiting committee members should strongly urge that the unit head/assistant director address these issues with the candidate explicitly, in writing, providing specific suggestions as to how job performance might be improved).

d) Conduct any formal interviews for which unit head/assistant director is an appropriate source of information. For this part of the meeting, the unit head/assistant director is asked to respond to standard questions (Appendix B), in exactly the same manner as interviews with other individuals concerning the specific area of responsibility chosen by the candidate for evaluation.

5) Committee may meet with executive officer(s) of academic department(s) or college served by candidate's library, or with chair of departmental library committee (required for unit heads; optional for assistant librarians).

The evaluation committee may ask interviewees to address the following issues:

- general perception of candidate's competency
- relationship of the candidate to faculty and students
- particular strengths and/or specific problems

In addition, executive officer(s) and/or departmental library committee chairs may be asked for formal interviews concerning specific areas of responsibility, as appropriate, if such individuals are included on lists developed by unit head/assistant director in consultation with the candidate.

6) Each committee member interviews individuals selected from lists developed by unit head/assistant director in consultation with candidate, until required number of interviews have been completed.

Refer to Appendix A for suggestions as to setting up and conducting telephone or personal interviews. Interview responsibility at this stage may be divided among the two evaluators. Inasmuch as both evaluators are not present for each of these interviews, accurate summaries of comments are especially important.

As appropriate, committee members may utilize for Areas of Evaluation 1 through 4 (Information Services; Collection Development; Management/Administration; Cataloging/Bibliographic Control) the standard questionnaires developed for this purpose by the Departmental Library Services Advisory Committee (see Appendix B). Other questions may be asked at the discretion of the evaluators; standard questions may also be omitted.

For Areas of Evaluation 5 and 6 (special projects and/or other assignments; Library/University service), evaluators must develop questions appropriate to the specific nature of responsibilities. Such questions may address factors such as the importance of the project or responsibility and the extent of candidate's contribution; creativity in development of procedures; and whether the project or responsibility was completed in a satisfactory and timely fashion.

7) Committee members meet to compare information collected via interviews, and to complete evaluation form. Copy of evaluation form is sent to candidate, along with supplemental form for his/her signature and written comments.

Committee members must provide explicit and detailed written comments in respect to particular strengths as well as noting any areas with potential for improvement. Comments from interviewees may be quoted verbatim, but must not be ascribed to specific individuals out of respect for maintaining confidentiality. (The names of all persons interviewed, however, should be listed at the head of the statement.) Organize comments under headings for specific areas of evaluation as well as for overall job performance.

8) Committee meets with candidate to discuss evaluation.

Praise and helpful suggestions may be offered, as appropriate. Information obtained via interviews may be summarized for candidate, but confidentiality of sources must be maintained. Candidate should be encouraged to provide written comments on supplemental form as to:

- specific steps to be taken in regard to aspects of job performance which might be improved;

- any explanations or reservations candidate may have concerning the evaluation process or information obtained thereby.

Committee members should remind candidate that both the evaluation form filled out by evaluators and the supplemental form completed by the candidate personally become part of his/her official record and are forwarded to the unit head/assistant director as well as to the Director of Departmental Library Services; but that only the evaluation form will be appended to the candidate's future application for promotion/tenure.

In conclusion, evaluators should ask whether candidate has any additional questions in regard to future evaluation procedures.

9) Evaluation form and supplemental form are forwarded to Director of Departmental Library Services; copies sent to unit head or assistant director.

Other documentation (formal letters, summaries of interviews, telephone questionnaire forms, etc.) remains with the evaluation committee and should be kept throughout the entire period in which the committee performs this function. All documentation should be destroyed upon completion of a particular committee's responsibilities, i.e.:

a) Candidate has achieved or has been denied tenure or promotion;

b) Candidate has submitted a written request to the Director of Departmental Library Services requesting the appointment of a new committee for subsequent evaluations.

In the case of (b), documentation is not forwarded to the new committee from previous committees. The new committee will, however, receive copies of all previous evaluation forms.

If, at any time during the evaluation process, the candidate or members of the visiting committee have questions or reservations about specific procedures or the way in the which the evaluation is progressing generally, the Director of Departmental Library Services may be contacted for further information and advice.

2/87

INTERVIEWING TECHNIQUE

Committee members may structure individual interviews in accordance with various factors relating to the status of the candidate (tenured or untenured; nature of job responsibilities), as well as to the degree to which individuals being interviewed could be expected to be familiar with specific aspects of the candidate's job performance. A flexible approach is encouraged. All of the standard questions on specific areas of evaluation (Appendix B) may not be appropriate to each and every individual who is to be interviewed; committee members are also free to ask additional questions which are not on the standard lists.

In conducting interviews, either in person or by telephone, the following general outline should be utilized:

- introduce oneself, as member of evaluation committee;
- state the purpose of the interview or call; mention that information is being solicited in support of future tenure/promotion application;
- note that the interview will be brief; confidentiality will be maintained;
- ask permission to ask a few questions (i.e., provide the individual with an opportunity to decline gracefully, if he/she so prefers);
- ask specific questions, as formulated in advance by the Departmental Library Services Advisory Committee or by members of the candidate's visiting committee;
- ask if the individual cares to provide any additional comments;
- thank the individual for his/her time.

In interviewing individuals who are not members of the University Library faculty, it may be appropriate to make the initial contact by letter. See example on following page. With minor alterations, this model may also be utilized to arrange a telephone interview.

It is also satisfactory for potential interviewees to return annotated questionnaire forms or a formal letter in lieu of a personal or telephone interview.

(SAMPLE LETTER)

Professor Jane Smith
Chair, Library Committee
Department of Transportation
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Dear Professor Smith:

The Director of Departmental Library Services, Barton Clark, has appointed me to serve on a visiting committee, along with Professor May Jones of the Religious Studies Library, to evaluate the job performance of Assistant Professor Leslie Johnson, who has been employed in the Transportation Library since August, 1984.

If you have time within the next few weeks for a brief interview, we would greatly appreciate having the opportunity to talk with you concerning your perception of Professor Johnson's relationship with faculty and students, general competency as a librarian, and any particular strengths or specific problems in respect to job performance which may have been evident over the past year. We would also like to ask you a few more specific questions concerning Professor Johnson's work in the area of collection development; enclosed is a copy of the questions we would ask if you agree to meet with us.

The information we obtain through interviews with you and your colleagues in the Transportation Department may be utilized as supporting documentation when Professor Johnson comes up for tenure in 1989. We are, however, concerned only with job performance and not with research, publications, professional service, and other tenure criteria.

The interview should take no more than an hour, and will be arranged at your convenience. I will call you next week to ask if you are willing to meet with us. Thank you very much for your interest and assistance.

Sincerely yours,

John Doe, Associate Professor
Popular Culture Librarian

cc: M. Jones

Encl.

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

NOTE: All of the following recommendations have been approved by the library faculty and will be implementd for the 1988 evaluation period.

REPORT OF THE AD HOC

PEER REVIEW TASK FORCE

The Peer Review Task Force has been active since January of 1987 in examining the present peer review system used in the KU Libraries, in gathering information about peer review systems used in other academic libraries, in reading about the philosophical bases for peer review, and in discussing among ourselves various options that might be adopted by the Library Faculty Assembly. In this process, we have sought to involve LFA members to a great degree, principally by holding a special LFA Forum on this issue and then by conducting an hour-long interview with each librarian who accepted our invitation to talk to one of us in person about his/her likes and dislikes regarding the present system. During those interviews, we asked for feedback on several systems used at other institutions and on other options which the task force had been considering.

It was obvious from the beginning that opinions vary quite widely among present librarians on the merits of the peer review system presently used--and, for that matter, on the validity of peer review itself. This wide variety of opinions found expression in the open forum held in February, and was certainly confirmed by the individual interviews conducted in June and July. One of the first questions we asked each librarian was to rate his/her satisfaction with the present system on a 1-to-5 point scale. The results of this question are listed in Table I. It is difficult to draw too many conclusions or make many generalizations from this chart, except to say that the present system seems to appeal rather well to Librarian I's, slightly less to Librarian II's, and more markedly less to Librarian III's. The median rating from all librarians is a 3, which suggests that the majority of LFA members see both good and bad features about the present system. (The average rating of 2.84 is not significantly different from the median for statistical purposes.) The median rating for Librarian I's is also a 3 (and the average 3.1). The median rating among LII's is also 3 (and the average 2.93). For LIII's, however, the median rating drops to 2.5, with the average 2.59. The range among supervisors when they are segregated from the entire pool is also wide, but harder to calculate. See Notes 1-3 to the Table I.

The most commonly cited dissatisfactions with the present system expressed during the interviews were: a) that the persons assigning the ratings "don't know what I do" or (a variation of this) that it is the supervisor's job to assign ratings since s/he knows my work best; b) that there is no feedback to me which accompanies the rating assigned by the Peer Review Committee; c) that criteria for evaluation are not clearly defined; and d) that service on the Peer Review Committee is too time-consuming (or, alternatively, the entire evaluation process is too time-consuming in light of the relatively small difference it makes in terms of actual dollar increases to salaries). It should be emphasized, however, that, as might be expected from the statistics mentioned above, a roughly equal number of librarians did not feel these to be important drawbacks. Almost everyone, even those who feel negatively about the present system, admitted to some degree that a system in which ratings are initially assigned by supervisors builds in inequities based on the premise that supervisors can't or don't consistently compare their supervisees to librarians in other departments. Quite a number of librarians also felt that a group of five peers could provide a "fresher," "more objective," or "fairer" evaluation than could the supervisors. A few people mentioned the benefit of having regular peer review as a lead-up to promotion and tenure decisions. A few

people mentioned the role of peer review as part of a professional responsibility to help ensure, encourage, and reward excellent services to our clientele.

To tabulate every positive and negative comment heard, or to try to relate the connections and quite possibly the contradictions among opinions expressed and points made by librarians would probably not be useful, at least not in this report. (Notes taken during each interview, although confidential, will be kept for future reference.) The three of us have concluded that because there is an almost equal degree of satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the present system we should not propose anything radically different from the system used now, even though several quite different proposals had strong appeal to one or more of us personally. Instead, we would like to propose to the LFA membership a group of modifications to the present system which address and would, we hope, ameliorate some of the concerns expressed by a majority or even a significant minority of the present LFA membership but which at the same time would not significantly upset those who are essentially comfortable with the present system. (Note that although the median and average ratings are both 3.0, the two ratings with the most "votes" was a tie between 4.0 and 3.0, with 3.5 tied with 2.0 for second place.)

Aspects of the Present System Which Should Be Kept:

I. Assignment of Ratings.

Perhaps the most divisive issue is the simple decision of who assigns the ratings first. Even among supervisors, there was sharp disagreement on this issue, with some admitting that they can't or don't evaluate their supervisees in light of the entire library faculty and others feeling either that their traditional prerogative has been usurped, or that they are helpless to counsel their supervisees on how to improve their ratings since no specific feedback is provided by the PRC. It should be pointed out that two of the three members of the PRTF are supervisors, although each of them supervises only one other librarian. We are unanimous, however, in recommending that initial ratings of librarians continue to be made by the PRC. We are convinced: a) that five persons elected by their peers who put themselves to the task can make and have made fair, informed, and, in the long run, accurate evaluations of their peers; b) that the PRC does and has put great weight on the supervisor's evaluation as well as on information supplied by each librarian, but that they are also able to do so in the context of a much broader picture of library faculty performance; c) that assignment of ratings by one body rather than a dozen supervisors makes the criteria more consistent (even if those criteria are not explicitly stated); d) that adequate appeals procedures do already exist, in which the supervisor as well as the librarian may participate and which can correct any truly gross injustices which might be perpetrated by PRC; e) that it is damaging to PRC's performance of its responsibility to have to work under the pressure of potentially "spoiling" a previously assigned high rating; and f) that the library administration is less likely to capriciously overturn the rating of a duly-elected committee of peers than one of an individual supervisor. (We're not saying that this has happened in the past.)

Initially, at least one of us favored a system in which the supervisors did assign a rating, but the ratings would be placed on a

separate sheet of the FASAR which would be removed before the FASAKs are forwarded to PRC. This would allow the librarian to see the supervisor's rating, but would not put pressure on the PRC; their recommendation of a rating may be different from the supervisor's but would not be technically an overturning. If the ratings of supervisor and PRC differed, the responsibility would be on the appropriate Assistant Dean and/or Dean to reconcile them. This proposal has merit, and did receive some favorable reaction during the interviews, but a) may be too complicated to put to a vote, and b) might not significantly reduce the resentment which would be almost inevitable if the rating of the PRC was lower--i.e., knowing that the PRC did not see the supervisor's rating and thus did not technically overturn it wouldn't really make any difference to most librarians who would get different ratings.

II. Feedback from PRC to Librarians and Supervisors.

One wants very much to help one's colleagues improve their performance, and certainly one way to do this is through an evaluation mechanism. However, this is not the primary function of the peer review evaluation procedure. Instead, it functions to assign ratings which are used as the basis for merit salary raises and, secondarily, to provide information for future promotion and tenure decisions. It is the duty of supervisors to give guidance to supervisees, and the prerogative of librarians to ask for it, at any appropriate time, not just at the end of the year or during promotion procedures. We do understand the frustration the lack of specific feedback has frequently caused, but we conclude that the kind of feedback which most librarians have in mind would seriously compromise the confidentiality of the PRC's deliberations and thus jeopardize the very benefits which derive from its existence. We believe that the visitation component of the peer review process which we outline below, although coming before the rating is actually assigned, will expedite a more personalized connection between each librarian and the PRC. Also, the changes we propose to the FASAR itself would, while not providing for specific feedback from the PRC to librarians, elicit somewhat more specific comments by the supervisors which we feel would be useful for the librarian as well as for the PRC.

Changes and New Components Proposed for the Peer Review Process

I. Visitation.

Primarily to address the frequent negative comment that "the PRC does not know what I do," we propose that, in the fall of each year (beginning in the fall of 1988) after the PRC has had organizational meetings and some time before the FASARs are distributed, each of the five members be assigned to visit roughly one fifth of the librarians who are scheduled to be evaluated that year in the librarian's work area for approximately one hour. Alternatively, more than one PRC member could visit each librarian if that were deemed prudent and if time allowed. The purpose of the visitation is to acquaint at least one member of the PRC with each librarian being evaluated, particularly of course in terms of the librarian's responsibilities and accomplishments during the previous evaluation period. Although

the PRC member may ask questions, it would be the responsibility of the librarian being visited to organize the presentation in such a way as to best present the complexities and uniqueness of her/his work as well as the connections her/his work has to the overall operations of the Libraries. In a sense, this would be an oral, in-person equivalent of the current Part I of the FASAR. It would benefit, we hope, those librarians who feel (rightly or wrongly) that their writing skills are not as superior as those of others and that this has been to their disadvantage, and also those who feel that they are less well-known than the majority of their colleagues, but it is also intended to provide the PRC with yet one more source of valuable information on each librarian and to help each librarian feel more confident that her/his job and contributions to the Libraries--not just his/her personality--is known by the PRC.

II. Frequency of Review.

Partly because of the additional work that Proposal I would entail, but primarily on its own merits, we propose that the interval of peer review be reduced from one to two years for tenured Librarian II's and from one to three years for all Librarian III's. This proposal met with generally positive comments, particularly from LII's and LIII's. Although it should be obvious that continued professional growth and competence in one's responsibilities are expected after promotion to the ranks of LII and LIII, it is also true that the rate of growth may legitimately slow down after the first six or eight years. Differences in ratings from year to year for LII's and LIII's are perhaps due as much to the differences of the standards and perspectives on PRC as to any difference in the librarian's performance (although research and service are still likely to fluctuate). This is an inevitable drawback to any system of peer review, but not, we think, sufficient reason to scrap it. However, it is possible to conclude from our interviews that one reason LIII's may be somewhat more dissatisfied with the present peer review system than LI's and LII's is that these fluctuations in their ratings make the process itself less legitimate.

There are two conditions we would urge as part of this proposal. First, the most recent FASAR and other accompanying documentation of all LII's and LIII's who are not being evaluated in a given year should be available to the PRC even in "off" years. This is to allow the PRC to compare, if it wishes, the performance of LII's and LIII's who are being evaluated that year to all of his/her peers. Secondly, except in extremely unusual circumstances, such as a lengthy illness or a transfer from one department to another--and then only by formal request of the supervisor and the appropriate Assistant Dean--tenured librarians may not request to be formally re-evaluated during their "off" years. For the benefit of not having to go through the peer review process every year, the librarian accepts the corollary, viz. the rating assigned will be in effect for two (or three) years for the purpose of salary distribution formulas. Granting more than rare exceptions would subvert the entire proposal.

We point out that this proposal does not forbid an LII or LIII from seeking, or a supervisor from giving, any type of formal or informal evaluation at any time between the formal PRC evaluations. We would suggest, however, that to minimize confusion the formal FASAR

not be used, and that no record of these informal evaluations accompany the formal FASAR or be placed in any official personnel file.

We believe that, with proposals I and II combined, the net effect would not increase the work on the PRC and could even reduce it. The opportunity to meet with colleagues and hear in some detail about their responsibilities and accomplishments would add a further dimension of interest and professional growth for those members serving on the committee as well. Some unnecessary stress and time would be taken away from LII's and LIII's and their supervisors. We also think that Proposal II may help the entire package of proposals appeal to LII's and LIII's, who seem to have the most dissatisfaction with the present system. Our proposals may not do what some would have preferred (e.g., restoring initial assignment of ratings to supervisors, requiring specific feedback from PRC, etc.), but with this proposal at least they will not have to go through the process as often. We believe that LI's who feel that LII's and LIII's should not be given any special treatment will, ultimately, change their minds when they, too, become LII's and LIII's.

III. Changes to the FASAR

Although not as frequently mentioned as some of the other negative comments, some people feel that the current FASAR is too free-form and may have allowed supervisors to say virtually nothing about a librarian's weaknesses or areas in which s/he could improve over the past period's performance. Some supervisors may have felt that since they aren't allowed to assign a rating they aren't required to say anything negative, either. At the same time, there is generally good feeling about the open nature of the form--its reliance on prose statements rather than short answers or numerical scales or points assigned. The changes to the FASAR we propose would, we feel, address the negative comments but not change the general nature of the form. Specifically, in place of the one vague direction on the present form's Part I ("Statements Relative to the Library Assignment") we propose that the librarian respond to three requests:

A. Describe your library assignment and responsibilities during the past evaluation period. Relate them to the responsibilities of your department and to those of the Libraries.

B. Describe specific activities during this evaluation period which contributed to the fulfillment of your library assignment. Include progress made on previous suggestions for improvement.

C. Identify areas for further improvement and professional growth.

We propose that the supervisor's evaluation have three parallel requests:

A. Comment on this librarian's understanding of his/her library assignment and responsibilities and on their relationship to those of the department and the Libraries.

B. Evaluate the quality and, where applicable, quantity of the librarian's performance during this evaluation period. Include accomplishments listed in Parts II-V as well as job-related activities

and progress made on previous suggestions for improvement.

C. Suggest areas for continued professional growth and improvement.

We believe that these questions or requests would help standardize the information which the PRC has to work with and help ensure consistency of criteria applied to the assignment of ratings. This may not be the same as more uniform criteria for evaluation, but it makes explicit the expectation that all librarians can improve, no matter how exceptional they may be, and that some attention to suggestions for improvement is expected. It also suggests that some attention be given to the quantity as well as the quality of work performed, but allows for the great diversity of library responsibilities and methods by which they are accomplished. These questions and their answers may also help the Assistant Deans, the Dean, and the PRC evaluate the supervisors themselves. (A supervisor's evaluations of his/her librarians is obviously a major component of his/her responsibility and should be reviewed accordingly.) They also help each librarian set his/her own goals, objectives, or performance standards for the next evaluation period, although we have deliberately avoided those terms.

The three of us feel we have worked hard and spent considerable amounts of time examining the issues of peer review and the concerns of our colleagues and that the time and experience have been very worthwhile for us professionally and personally. We sincerely hope that our recommendations will help resolve the dissatisfaction which many librarians feel toward the current system as well as the question of the Peer Review Committee's legitimacy. We are willing and eager to assist the LFA Executive Committee in whatever manner is deemed appropriate in presenting our proposals to the LFA membership.

Respectfully submitted,

Rob Melton

Rob Melton, Chair, LII

Susan Hitchens

Susan Hitchens, LII

Donna Koepp

Donna Koepp, LII

October 14, 1987

TABLE I

Satisfaction with Current Peer Review System by KU Librarians

Asked how well the present peer review system works, with 1="Doesn't work at all" and 5="Works very well, no changes needed." Answers such as "about 3 or 4" etc. have been tabulated as a half-point. The "Supervisors" column includes only those currently supervising another librarian and does include the two Assistant Deans. All but two librarians (both LIII's) agreed to be interviewed by a member of the PRTF.

Rating	Total	LI's	LII's	LIII's	Supervisors[1]
5	1	0	1	0	0
4.5	1	1	0	0	0
4	9	2	4	3	3
3.5	7	1	5	1	2
3	9	3	2	4	2[2]
2.5	7	2	2	3	2
2	7	0	4	3	2[3]
1.5	2	0	2	0	0
1	5	1[4]	1	3[5]	1[5]
	48	10	21	17[6]	12

Notes:

[1]Some, but not all, of the supervisors made a distinction between how the system works for themselves as librarians and how it works for them as supervisors.

[2]One of these supervisors gives the system a "4" for how it works for him/herself, less so for her/his department. The second rated the system a "3" from the point of view of a supervisor, but "4" for him/herself. In the "Total" column, this person is tabulated as a "3.5."

[3]One of these two supervisors gives the system a "4" for how it works for him/herself. S/he is tabulated as a "3" in the "Total" column.

[4]This LI is opposed to all systems based on merit. S/he conceded that ours "may be no worse than any other" that is required to use merit as a basis for salary distribution. Several other LI's and LII's had similar views, but did not rate the system as a "1" on that basis alone.

[5]Two LIII's gave, in the opinions of the Task Force members who interviewed them, either inconclusive or untabulatable responses.

[6]Excludes two LIII's who declined to be interviewed.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL

(from Structure for the Ranking of Librarians)

A Librarian is employed for a stated term of five years. Normally, such appointments will be renewed at the expiration of the term upon favorable evaluation if justified by the needs and resources of the Library and the University. The evaluative procedures and the notification of the individual are identical to those detailed for an Associate Librarian in Section I.B.3.

If a Librarian plans to retire within one year after the expiration of the appointment, the procedures detailed for an Associate Librarian shall apply. (See Article I.B.3.)

II. LIBRARY APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION COMMITTEES

In order to provide for a broad-based evaluation for appointment and promotion within the Library, there shall be two Appointment and Promotion Committees: (A) Associate Librarian Appointment and Promotion Committee; and, (B) Librarian Appointment and Promotion Committee. These committees will advise the University Librarian relative to appointments, reappointments, promotions, and decisions not to reappoint based on evaluations by the immediate supervisor, department head, and division chairman and the curriculum vitae prepared by each staff member being reviewed.

A. Associate Librarian Appointment and Promotion Committee

The Associate Librarian Appointment and Promotion Committee shall consist of six elected members with the rank of Associate Librarian, two from each of the three divisions within the Library, to be elected by all professional librarians. The length of service on this committee shall be for two years in staggered terms. Members may be re-elected. Elections will be held annually by secret ballot to fill the two-year terms. Should a member resign before the end of this term, the vacancy will be filled until the next election by the Associate Librarian in the same division with the next-highest number of votes in the last election.

B. Librarian Appointment and Promotion Committee

The Librarian Appointment and Promotion Committee shall consist of six elected members with the rank of Librarian, two from each of the three divisions within the Library, to be elected by all professional librarians. The length of service on this Committee shall be for two years in staggered terms. Members may be re-elected. Elections will be held annually by secret ballot to fill the two year terms. Should a member resign before the end of his/her term, the vacancy will be filled until the next election by the Librarian in the same division with the next-highest number of votes in the last election.

In the event that there are fewer than two available members from one of the three divisions holding the rank of Librarian, the Librarians at large shall elect one or more from their general membership to a temporary one year term in order to complete the Committee's membership of six Librarians. If, at any time, there should not be so many as six members of the staff holding the rank of

Librarian, the University Librarian shall make temporary one-year appointments to this Committee from other ranks and representing the appropriate division(s) to complete its membership.

The University Librarian shall refer all cases being considered for initial appointment or promotion to the rank of Librarian to this committee for review and advice. The University Librarian shall consider the advice of this committee when making an initial appointment or promotion to the rank of Librarian.

III. CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND CONTINUING EMPLOYMENT

An appointment to the professional library staff requires the academic preparation which is evidenced by the possession of the professional degree. The basic quality which must be present for promotion is the ability to perform at a high professional level in areas which contribute to the educational and research mission of the institution--in public service, collection development, bibliographic organization and control, or automation.

Evaluation of the level of performance may take into account judgments of members of the academic community outside the Library, as well as those of colleagues in the Library.

Additional criteria for promotion in rank may include:

A. Activities related to inquiry and research;
B. Active participation in professional and learned societies;
C. Teaching, not necessarily in a classroom situation, organization of or appearance before institutes, workshops, or similar meetings, and consultancies;
D. Needs of the Library and the University;
E. Resources of the Library and the University;
and, F. The professional characteristics of the candidate, qualitatively and quantitatively measured, including:
1. Education and training;
2. Experience;
3. Skills;
4. Accomplishments;
5. Potential for growth and achievement;
6. Competitive demand for a person of the qualifications needed;
7. Integrity;
8. Good judgment;
9. Self-reliance;
and, 10. Capacity for cooperation.

These criteria may not include race, color, sex, age, religion, handicap, national origin, or veteran status.

IV. APPEAL PROCEDURE

A librarian wishing to appeal non-reappointment, suspension, discharge, or the rank assigned, has access to the Library Appeal Procedure. Before a hearing request is made, the librarian should discuss the rank assignment with the University Librarian or the

Appointment and Promotion Committee which advised the University Librarian regarding the rank in an attempt to reach an agreement through informal means. The appeal must be made within twenty-one days after the date of the letter of notification of decision. The entire appeals procedure within the Library should be completed within sixty days. Within twenty-one days after receipt of a hearing request, the Appeals Committee shall decide whether or not there are sufficient grounds to hear a case and whether or not to accept written statements in lieu of personal appearances by participants other than the appellant. All hearings shall be open only to participants. If a decision is made not to hear a case, the Committee shall notify the librarian initiating the appeal in writing as to the reasons for its action. The decision about rank agreed upon as a result of these procedures shall be retroactive to the original date of the review decision.

After the appeals procedures listed below have been exhausted, if the librarian feels that he/she has a real grievance, he/she may take his/her case to the Faculty Grievance Committee. (See Policies, Section IV).

PROCEDURE

A. Appeals by General and Assistant Librarians whose promotions or appointments have previously been reviewed by the University Librarian:

   1. A formal request for a hearing should be written by the librarian being ranked or reviewed to the chairman of the Librarian Appointment and Promotion Committee. A copy of this request should also go to the University Librarian.

   2. The Appeals Committee shall consist of the members of the Librarian Appointment and Promotion Committee.

   3. In arriving at its recommendations, the Appeals Committee shall consider or review only documents or other material to which both the librarian being ranked and the University Librarian are afforded access.

   4. The Appeals Committee shall submit its report, with recommendations for settlement of the case, to the University Librarian. If the University Librarian's final decision does not concur with the judgment of the Appeals Committee, he should state the reasons for this in detail to the Appeals Committee and to the librarian being ranked. This action constitutes the exhaustion of the internal appeals procedure.

B. Appeals by Assistant Librarians whose promotions or appointments have previously been reviewed by the Associate Librarian Appointment and Promotion Committee:

1. A formal request for a hearing should be written by the librarian being ranked or reviewed to the chairman of the Librarian Appointment and Promotion Committee. Copies of the request should also go to the chairman of the Associate Librarian Appointment and Promotion Committee and the University Librarian.

2. The Appeals Committee shall consist of the members of the Librarian Appointment and Promotion Committee.

3. In arriving at its recommendations, the Appeals Committee shall consider or review only documents or other material to which both the librarian being ranked and the Associate Librarian Appointment and Promotion Committee are afforded access.

4. The Appeals Committee shall submit its report, with recommendations for settlement of the case, to the University Librarian. If the University Librarian's final decision does not concur with the judgment of the Appeals Committee, he should state the reasons for this in detail to the Appeals Committee and to the librarian being ranked. This action constitutes the exhaustion of the internal appeals procedure.

C. Appeals by Associate Librarians and Librarians whose promotions or appointments have previously been reviewed by the Librarian Appointment and Promotion Committee:

1. A formal request for a hearing should be written by the librarian being ranked or reviewed to the University Librarian. A copy of this request should also go to the chairman of the Librarian Appointment and Promotion Committee.

2. The Appeals Committee shall consist of the University Librarian.

3. In reaching a decision, the University Librarian shall consider or review only documents or other material to which both the librarian being ranked and the Librarian Appointment and Promotion Committee are afforded access. This action constitutes the exhaustion of the internal appeals procedure.

Merit Increase Review

University of California (Riverside)
University Library

PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATIVE MEMORANDUM NO. 2.2 Revised February, 1986

CRITERIA FOR PERSONNEL ACTION

The purpose of this memorandum is to outline a standarized interpretation of criteria for personnel action in the academic librarian series. It is intended as an augmentation of the guidelines in Sections 210-4 and 360 of the Academic Personnel Manual (APM). It is anticipated that each year, the memorandum will be reviewed, discussed and revised if necessary.

Relevance of Activities to Criteria

By way of introduction to the four categories of criteria upon which librarians are reviewed, Section 360-10b. states:

> A candidate for merit increases or promotion in this series shall be judged on the basis of the first of the following criteria, and to the extent they are relevant, on one or more of the last three.
>
> Criterion 1: Professional Competence and Quality of Service within the Library.
>
> Criterion 2: Professional Activity Outside the Library
>
> Criterion 3: University and Public Activity
>
> Criterion 4: Research and Other Creative Activity

In all ranks, it is understood that under Criterion 1, all librarians will be judged on consistency of performance, grasp of library methods, command of their subjects, continued growth in their fields, judgement, leadership, originality, ability to work effectively with others, and ability to relate their functions to the more general goals of the Library and the University.

Study and research beyond the immediate demands of the position are essential to continued growth, continuing command of subject, and continuing ability to relate functions to more general goals. Individuals should seek opportunities to learn and to contribute to the improvement of the Library's services. Leadership is demonstrated in activity beyond the implementation of goals or ideas already in concrete form. The kind of leadership expected is that which focuses and identifies goals and programs, conceptualizes them, and generates and carries out ideas which prove workable. Originality of ideas or concepts may be demonstrated in one's area of specialization or in research and writing. It includes self-motivated study of appropriately selected problems and original or workable resolution of them. It is also understood that the level of competence and the scope of contribution required for a one-step merit increase become greater as a librarian advances in rank.

In considering individual candidates, reasonable flexibility is to be exercised in weighing the comparative relevance of the four criteria. However, demonstrated superior professional ability and attainment are indispensable qualifications for promotion.

Superior Achievement

Section 210-4e(2) dealing with merit increases and promotions states:

> At the time of original appointment to a title in this series; each appointee shall be informed that continuation or advancement is justified only superior achievement and qualities as manifested by the appointee. Therefore, only librarians of demonstrated ability and achievement will be continued or promoted after thorough and objective review. If an individual has not demonstrated requisite development, there is no obligation on the part of the University to continue or promote.

The concept of superior achievement is present throughout the section of the APM that deals with librarians. An absolute definition of the meaning of "superior" is probably not possible or desirable. One way to understand what is meant is to examine what is not included. Mere adequacy of performance is not enough; superior achievement does not mean doing essentially the same work at the same level of expertise over an extended period of time.

Documented evidence of growth and development is needed. Since the University is not obligated to promote, it is possible for individual to "top out" at certain levels. However, even in these cases, a continuing high level of performance is expected in order for an individual to be continued in the series.

Career Growth

Section 210-4e(2) states:

> For some, promotion may involve a position change; for other promotion may not necessarily involve position change, but will depend on increased responsibility as well as growing competence and contribution in the same position.

It is evident that growth is a central concept in the APM. Growth implies the achievement of increasing expertise in the primary assignment throughout the career. In addition, it is necessary to look outside the immediate confines of the position toward what might be, not just what is. An individual's professional interests and activities should increase in depth and breadth as his or her career progresses. Advancement or promotion is awarded in recognition of the increasing expertise and higher level of contribution that a librarian must demonstrate over the years. For example, performance expectations for Associate Librarian, Step V are higher that those for Associate Librarian, Step II. Growth should not take place haphazardly, but should reflect the concepts of relevance, balance, planning, and quality.

Section 360-10c states:

> Demonstrated superior professional ability and attainment are indispensable qualifications for promotion to the ranks of Associate Librarian

and Librarian. However, such promotion should be justified not only by excellence of service and attainment, but also demonstrated professional growth and accomplishment and/or superior assumption of greater responsibility.

As the librarian advances in the series, he or she should become an increasingly valuable asset to the Library and to the profession. The requisite career development must enhance both the quality of the specific position responsibilities and the overall value of the individual to the institution. Activities that contribute to this end must be selected with foresight., This requires judgement on the part of the librarian and the unit or department head to ensure that activities are relevant to and of value to the Library. The concept of balance, planning, and quality of the contribution serve as important guidelines for determining relevance.

Balance

As a career develops, the concept of balance should lead the librarian away from almost exclusive concentration on the primary responsibility toward increasing involvement with one or more of the activities in criteria 2-4. A balanced and mature career must demonstrate achievement in one or more of criteria 2-4 as well as superiority in criterion 1.

Over an extended period of time, single-minded concentration in one activity, to the exclusion of other activities, is not enough to justify continued advancement. Nowhere is it suggested that, as a librarian advances through the ranks, any long-term decrease in the level of performance of the primary responsibilities is acceptable.

Balance is not attained by undertaking activities in all four areas merely to show some activity in each. There is no requirement that a career must develop in all four areas. A smattering of mediocre or low-level performance in all of the areas would be unsatisfactory. The activities chosen must be of value and relevance to the librarian's career and to the Library and should show evidence of planned growth.

In the Associate Librarian and Librarian ranks (and to some small degree in the highest steps of the Assistant Rank), the concept of balance between Criterion 1 and Criteria 2-4 is extremely important. It is recognized that occassionally, for any one review period or portion thereof, organizational or professional pressures, etc., may make the optimum balance difficult to achieve. In this situation, the supervisor and the candidate should work together to restore balance. However, a temporary imbalance (where the factors accounting for it can be clearly identified) should not adversely affect the merit action.

Planning

In planning career development, the librarian should make sure that personal goals and objectives are compatible with and contribute to departmental and institutional goals and objectives. Career plans should not be rigid. In addition, the librarian should be prepared to make changes in career plans as the profession evolves in response to changing circumstances.

Quality

There is a direct link between the quality of a career and the quality of the work performed. Advancement is predicated upon increasing quality of performance in the primary assignment, the quality or level of outside activities, and the quality of the contribution to them. Obviously, for example, passive attendance at meetings does not rank as high as active participtiption (e.g., chairing a committee, serving on a panel, presenting a paper, or making substantive contributions to discussions).

MOVEMENT THROUGH THE RANKS AND PROMOTION

Six personnel actions are possible: merit (one step) advancement, promotion, no merit or promotion, accelerated merit or promotion, deferral, and termination. The policy and procedures for deferral are included in Personnel Administrative Memorandum No. 2.1, and the criteria for the other possible recommendations are described below and in the Academic Personnel Manual.

Since UCR librarians engage in a substantial amount of inter-departmental activity, it will be the responsibility of the supervisor reviewing the major portion of the candidate's activity to take into account evaluations from others supervising a candidate's work in the candidate's overall review and the recommendation for personnel action.

Accelerated Merit

Accelerated merit advancement or promotion according to the Academic Personnel Manual (210-4e (2)) is possible if achievement is exceptional. Acceleration is an unusual recommendation, and is explicitly reserved for those individuals who have performed in an extraordinary manner during the review period. In judging exceptional achievement, all areas of performance must satisfy the basic expectation of excellence, and some, but not necessarily all, must be clearly documented as exceptional. In all cases, excellent performance of the librarian's primary duties must be maintained consistently in order for the overall performance to warrant consideration for accelerated merit advancement or promotion.

Denial of Merit or Promotion

If, during the period under review, a librarian has not shown the superior achievement and qualities required for a merit increase, a recommendation may be made for denial of the proposed action. Both the level of competence and the scope of contributions required for a merit increase or promotion become greater as a librarian advances in rank. Even though performance of specific responsibility may be superior, it is possible that an individual's total contribution might not justify a recommendtion for a given review period. If a librarian is not recommended for a merit increase or promotion when eligible, it does not necessarily mean that the individual is being considered for termination. It may be simply that the performance during the review period is not considered sufficiently meritorious to warrant recommendation for advancement in the series. A librarian in potential career status who is not recommended for a merit increase when eligible should consider that such action is an indication that his or her performance may not merit the awarding of career status.

A recommendation for no merit increase may be made when meritorious achievement has not been documented and/or when the scope of contributions is not appropriately broad. Even though performance of some responsibilities may be meritorious, unless the individual's overall performance is meritorious, a merit increase may not be justified. If no merit increase is awarded, the individual will be eligible for consideration for merit advancement or promotion on an annual basis until advancement is achieved.

PHASES OF MOVEMENT IN THE LIBRARIAN SERIES.

In consideration of individual candidates and circumstances, reasonable flexibility must be exercised in applying the criteria. The interpretation and weighting of criteria are discussed below in relation to six separate phases of movement through the Librarian series:

I. Assistant Librarian - Movement through the Rank

II. Promotion to Associate Librarian

III. Associate Librarian - Movement through the Rank

IV. Promotion to Librarian

V. Librarian - Movement through the Rank

VI. Advancement to Librarian, Step V

I. ASSISTANT LIBRARIAN - MOVEMENT THROUGH THE RANK

Primary emphasis in on Criterion 1, with increased expectations for breadth and depth of understanding with movement through the rank. Specifically, emphasis is on:

1. Quality of performance in basic job assignment.

2. Steady work towards a sound professional foundation (in a learning or training mode).

3. Demonstrated gains in expertise in job assignment.

4. Acceptance, and competent execution, of responsibilities in addition to those of the assigned job (to a level and scope in keeping with step in rank), such as service on administrative committees, task forces, coordinating committees and so on.

   Note: These additional responsibilties, especially at the lower steps, should not dilute gains in expertise and in job skills.

5. Consistency of performance; judgement; grasp of subject area; ability to work effectively with others; increasing ability to relate function

to overall Library functions and to the goals of the University, self-starting attitude.

6. Growth within the job with movement through the rank; development of basic abilities.

Consideration of Criterion 3 - 4 should not play a major role in advancement through the rank, especially at the lower steps. Accelerated advancement is warranted when accomplishments during the review period are extraordinary and clearly go beyond expectations.

Denial of merit for those in the Assistant Librarian rank may occur when performance during the review period does not meet the criteria guidelines established for performance in this rank. If denial of merit does occur during time in rank and step, and performance does not improve significantly during the following year, termination might be an appropriate action according to APM 210-4 (2) and 360-17b (2).

For Assistant Librarians, the conferral of career status does not occur except in conjunction with promotion to Associate Librarian. If promotion to Associate Librarian with career status does not occur within a reasonable time (not more than six years), the individual may be subject to termination. (APM 360-17b (1).)

II. PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE LIBRARIAN

Promotion to Associate Librarian is not automatic; it is based on increasingly responsible performance through the rank of Assistant Librarian. Specifically, the recommendation for promotion is based on:

1. Potential for further growth, including assumption of a broader role in the activities of the Library, the campus, the University, and the profession.

2. Demonstrated professional skills acquired through performance of job responsibilities in the Assistant Librarian rank.

3. Solid record of professional competence in assigned responsibilities.

4. Anticipation of competence in the Associate Librarian rank.

III. ASSOCIATE LIBRARIAN - MOVEMENT THROUGH THE RANK

Movement through the rank of Associate Librarian is based on the achievement of a balance between continued solid fulfillment of, and maturity in, job responsibilities and 1) achievement of a broader view of the field of librarianship, the Library, and the system; 2) activity in professional or scholarly organizations; and 3) contributions in the participatory management structure of the Library. Demonstrated interest in and ability to contribute to the overall field, Library, and system are required. The quality of the contribution, not

just quantity, must be emphasized. Most often, this demonstration is made through committee assignments, task forces, etc., first at the campus level and then at the systemwide, state, or national level.

Acclerated advancement is warranted when accomplishments during the review period are extraordinary and go beyond expectations.

For Associate Librarians, the weighting of the criteria and expected levels of performance place greater emphasis on balance among the criteria with the balance shifting from the single measure of competent performance of primary job assignments focusing instead on breadth and depth of professional activity with the Library, the University, and the profession. Unless significant contributions are show in other criteria as indentified in the Academic Personnel Manual denial of merit may result, even with competent performance of the job assignments. Absence of documented competence in primary job assignments would also result in denial of merit.

Continued performance at an unsatisfactory level, particularly in potential career status, may make the individual subject to termination.

IV. PROMOTION TO LIBRARIAN

Promotion to the Librarian rank is not automatic. The top step of the Associate Librarian rank may be the appropriate indefinite rank and step for many librarians. A recommendation for promotion is based on the following:

1. Consistent and sustained demonstration of professional ability, emphasizing depth and breadth of contributions and experience.
2. Demonstrated outstanding ability
3. Emphasis on quality
4. Assumption of greater responsibility
5. Emphasis on strength of entire career
6. Anticipation of ability to perform in the Librarian rank.
7. Demonstrated ability to balance solid peformance of job responsibilities with broader concerns for the Library as a whole, the profession, the campus, the system, etc.

Section 210-4e (2) states:

> "Advancement in rank is possible in any special field of librarianship. However, an appointee will be eligible for promotion to the rank of Librarian only if there is demonstrated outstanding ability. For some, promotion may involve a position change; for others, promotion may not necessarily involve position change but will depend on increased responsibility as well as growing competence and contribution in the same position."

Promotion is possible to candidates with or without administrative responsibilities. In addition, technical competence or administrative responsibilities alone are not sufficient for promotion. Accomplishments in Criterion 1 alone is not sufficient. The candidate must contirbute in Criteria 2 - 4. Promotion will be recommended for candidates whose influence, impact, and creative approach to librarianship through activity in any of the criteria, are outstanding and go beyond the confines of the immediate surroundings of the job.

Based on the criteria of blance, outstanding ability, and substantial impact for the Librarian rank, denial of promotion to Librarian does not necessarily constitute a judgement of unsatisfactory performance.

IV. LIBRARIAN - MOVEMENT THROUGH THE RANK

Movement through the rank to Step IV is not automatic. When a recommendation for merit action is made, it must be based on solid, continued, and extended accomplishment and balance, specifically showing:

1. Realization of potential for superior professional performance and attainment.

2. Sustained quality contributions in a breadth of activity.

3. Contribution to and communication of expertise to the Library, campus, system, etc.

Accelerated advancement is warranted when accomplishments during the review period are extraordinary and go beyond expectations.

For Librarians, the weighting of the criteria and expected levels of performance place greater emphasis on balance among the criteria with the balance moving away from the single measure of competent performance of primary job assignments, focusing instead on breadth and depth of professional activity within the Library, the University, and the profession. Unless significant contributions are shown in other criteria as identified in the Academic Personnel Manual, denial of merit may result, even with competent performance of job assignments. Absence of documented competence in primary job assignments would also result in denial of merit. Continued performance at an unsatisfactory level, particularly in potential career status, may make that individual subject to termination.

VI. PROMOTION TO LIBRARIAN, STEP V

Advancement from Step IV to Step V is reserved for librarians with a truly distinguished career history, who have demonstrated significant achievement since obtaining Step IV.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

DEPARTMENTAL LIBRARY SERVICES: MERIT EVALUATION PROCEDURES

This document presents the system for determining salary increases on merit for faculty in Departmental Library Services. It includes a calendar for the annual review process and a personal annual report outline indicating possible activities that could be listed for each category with accompanying explanations and notes. Not every category may be applicable to all faculty, and categories used may vary from year to year. The final part of the document explains the weights of the various evaluation elements.

CALENDAR

The calendar for the annual review process is as follows:

1. Copies of this report are distributed to all Departmental Library Services faculty.

2. Each faculty member prepares a personal annual report (not exceed eight (8) pages and not to include documentation, letters, etc., unless requested), using the merit evaluation categories (see pp. 2-6) as a guide, and provides a current, updated curriculum vita.

3. All documents are submitted to the Director of Departmental Library Services.

4. The Departmental Library Services Advisory Committee reviews the documents.

5. The Departmental Library Services Advisory Committee recommends merit ratings for each faculty member.

6. The Director of Departmental Library Services allocates merit increases based upon the Departmental Library Services Advisory Committee recommendations.

7. The Director of Departmental Library Services confers with each faculty member who requests a meeting concerning all areas of her/his performance and also with the Assistant Director of unit head who performed the job performance.

8. A copy of the documentation is placed in the personnel file of the individual faculty member.

PERSONAL ANNUAL REPORT

A. Job Performance (Service to the Library and to the University)

Job performance is divided into two areas: service and management activities. Primary job performance is generally considered to be the carrying out of duties related to the job description. Other important areas of primary job performance include local service to the library and university, such as elected or appointed committee work, administrative duty, and other areas typically related to academic librarianship. Formal classroom teaching is felt to be a type of service to the university not typically regarded as part of librarianship, and, therefore, falls into the area of professional service. The examples provided are merely aspects of each category and are not intended to limit discussion only to those activities. Please list significant accomplishments, stressing special projects, new programs, or those activities and responsibilities you consider to be most important. This is your annual report and not the departmental library's so do not list everyday routines. This section should be brief but complete. Please do not exceed 2-3 pages. This section may be organized in outline form. Please indicate percentage of time spent in each activity reported.

1. Service

   a. Selection of materials: a collection policy statement, acquisitions lists, a weeding policy, or other activities requested by Director of Collections.

   b. Bibliographic control: original cataloging (including assignment of subject headings and classification and/or supervision of cataloging process), preparation of in-house indexes or finding guides to materials, provision of aids to using the online catalog.

   c. Reference service: maintenance of regularly scheduled reference hours; provision of online services; cooperative reference referral; the preparation of guides, handouts, and development of subject expertise through continuing education activities.

   d. Circulation services: efficient document delivery, stacks organization and maintenance, and effective patron liaison.

   e. User education: guides, maps, signs, tours, class presentations including participation in library-wide programs, print or non-print user guides, preparation of exhibits highlighting collections or services, and other teaching activities provided to students and faculty on campus.

f. Faculty liaison: regular contact with a wide spectrum of faculty through formalized departmental library committees or liaison, involvement in departmental committees such as curriculum committees and joint appointments or projects.

2. Management

a. Goal setting, planning, and problem solving: the ability to look at the environment and determine what enhancements to that environment are needed and plan for the achievement of that goal, such as planning for a new or improved service.

b. General management: ongoing administration of the library unit, including communication with subordinates, the handling of the physical plant, utilization of staff, priority setting, delegation of authority, the ability to complete tasks.

c. Management of library budgets: requests for funding, fiscal accountability.

d. Effective sharing of resources and cooperation: joint acquisition arrangements, sharing of student assistants, and cooperative reference arrangements.

e. Personnel management: hiring, training, and developing staff to their full potential; supervising student practica.

f. Committee work: library and university administrative committees such as search committees, Research and Publication Committee, Illinois LCS Operations committees.

g. Grant proposals: the preparation or receipt of grant proposals for improving library collections or operations, or for resource sharing and cooperation.

B. Publication and Other Scholarly or Creative Activities

Research and publication includes all types of published, performed or exhibited intellectual contributions reflecting scholarly or creative accomplishment or expertise. Indicate if work is refereed, invited, or had other professional review. If the work is co-authored, list authors in the order appearing in citation. Indicate relationship of this year's publications to previous years' annual reports (e.g., if published this year, was it reported last year as accepted or submitted?).

Use * to denote refereed item.
Use ** to denote invited item.

1. Books authored or co-authored (in print or accepted).

2. Books edited or co-edited (in print or accepted).

3. Chapters in books (in print or accepted).

4. Bulletins or reports (in print or accepted): reports of organizations, task forces, committees, etc., which are published. Non-published reports should be listed under A.2.b. or A.2.f. as appropriate.

5. Articles in journals (in print or accepted): material which involves research and is published in a professional journal.

6. Book reviews or abstracts (in print or accepted).

7. Published abstracts of any papers you have presented at conferences.

8. Other research or creative activities: artistic performances and exhibitions. Exhibits should be of regional and national significance and display knowledge and scholarship both in their preparation and content. Do not list University of Illinois Library exhibits, unless a published catalog has been produced. List in-house library exhibits under job performance (A).

C. Professional Service and Community Service

Professional service includes a wide range of regional or national service to colleagues, including attendance at conferences, planning and conducting conferences and workshops, editing professional journals, serving on or chairing committees, and/or membership in professional organizations. Level of contribution and degree of responsibility are important factors in evaluating the significance of personal contribution in this area. Election to national offices and invitations for lectures and consultancies are a reflection of national or regional stature in the profession. Papers or presentations read at conferences are considered a professional contribution, but should be listed under Publications if the paper is revised for publication at a later date. Formal classroom teaching and service on dissertation committees are professional contributions beyond those normally expected of librarians and represent stature in an academic field.

1. Recognitions and outstanding achievements, awards, etc.

2. Attendance at professional conferences, coursework or workshops taken to enhance professional development (including continuing education programs).

3. Formal consulting, paid or unpaid; serving as a referee.

4. Service on thesis or dissertation committees.

5. Formal classroom teaching: primary reponsibility for the conduct and teaching of a regular course at the college level.

6. Invited lecture off campus to professional group.

7. Workshops, institutes, training sessions conducted for professional groups.

8. Papers read at professional meetings and conferences, workshops or institutes. When (if) published, these may be listed under B.

9. Editorships of journals or other publications: serving on editorial boards, editing columns in journals, etc.

10. Membership in professional organizations.

11. Significant contributions or active involvement in professional organizations: offices held, service as chair or member of committees, preparation of bylaws or reports for committees or other professional groups. Provide a brief description of contributions and/or involvement in each committee.

12. Significant community activities, related to professional service.

D. Research in Progress

Continuing but uncompleted research or publication projects, as well as new research not yet published, should be listed, as it indicates a stable level of commitment to research activity. Briefly describe projects underway: complexity of work (e.g., is it an article or book, bibliography or annotated bibliography), role in joint projects, role in individual projects (e.g., author or editor). Indicate state of completion of projects: anticipated time span of project or projected date of completion. If work has been submitted, indicate date and to whom, including pagination. When (if) work is accepted, list under B.

1. Publications submitted for publication but not yet accepted.

2. Current research projects, planned, in process, but not yet submitted for publication.

3. Sabbatical projects.

4. Preparation of grant proposals or awards of grants for research.

TABULATION

Category		Weight
A.	Job Performance	4
B.	Publication and other scholarly or creative activities	2
C.	Professional and community service	3
D.	Research in progress	1

Each area, A-D, is given a specified weight, as shown. Within each area, each individual is given 0, 1, 2, or 3 points, to be multiplied by the weight of the area. Zero points are given if an individual has not accomplished anything in a given area during the year. One point is given for minimal performance, two for average activity, and three for superior performance in any area. Each individual's score is found by multiplying the number of points achieved by the weight of the area, and then by adding the numbers of points for areas A-D. (Example: Prof. Doe was given 3 points in Area A [weighted 4] for a score of 12 points in Area A. She received 1 point in Area B [weighted 2] for a score of 2 for Area B. She received 2 points in Area C [weighted 3] for a score of 6 points in Area C. She received 3 points in Area D [weighted 1] for a score of 3 points for Area D. Prof. Doe's total score is 23, which will be compared to total scores of all other members of the Departmental Library Services faculty.

Revised 12/86

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

Effective 3/85

MERIT RANKING GUIDELINES

Evaluators will use the attached merit ranking guidelines in conjunction with the annual salary review for exempt, non-exempt, merit zone, and bargaining unit staff. The document will assist evaluators in arriving at a short performance statement, based on the performance appraisal and including a numerical ranking, that can be translated centrally into a percentage increase.

While they cannot describe precisely any one staff member's performance, these guidelines will serve throughout the Libraries as standards of performance and will thereby contribute to cross-organizational equity. While objective and measurable, descriptors used in merit guidelines are not precisely quantifiable; thus, the use of such terms as "effective," "substantially exceeding," "fully acceptable," etc. by the evaluator will require the exercise of considerable interpretive judgement, a judgement that will necessarily be informed by a comparison of staff within the unit.

These guidelines describe five degrees of merit, Level 5 being the highest level of performance. Since the evaluator must look for consistency of performance over the last year, the evaluator must determine which level best reflects overall performance.

Level 5: Consistently performs all elements of the position at an exceptionally high level; services rendered or products generated are of an exceptionally high quality, and quantity, and are timely and clearly reflect a thorough understanding of the principles governing the areas of responsibility and of the Libraries policies, practices and priorities as they relate to the job. Work related interactions with staff and patrons are exceptionally effective. Contributions to library-wide, departmental and/or unit efforts are outstanding. Is thoroughly knowledgeable in all areas pertinent to the position.

Level 4: Consistently performs all major elements of the position at a level that substantially exceeds the requirements for the position; services rendered or products generated are of high quality and quantity and are timely. Work reflects a sound understanding of the principles governing the areas of responsibility and of the Libraries policies, practices and priorities. Work related interaction with staff and patrons are highly effective. Has made substantive contributions to library-wide, department, and/or unit efforts. Knowledge in areas related to the position is current and cogent.

Level 3: Consistently performs at a fully satisfactory level in meeting the requirements in all major elements of the position; services rendered or products generated are of a fully satisfactory quality, quantity and are timely. Work reflects an understanding of the principles governing the areas of responsibility and of major Library policies, practices and priorities. Work related interactions with staff and patrons are sufficiently effective to enable carrying out the responsibilities of the position with competence. Contributions to library-wide, departmental and/or unit efforts are usually good. Knowledge in areas related to position is sufficient for satisfactory performance.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Level 2: Often but does not consistently perform at a satisfactory level in meeting the requirements in all major elements of the position; services rendered or products generated are frequently but not always acceptable in quality, quantity or timeliness. Work does not consistently reflect an understanding of basic principles or of the Libraries policies, practices or priorities. Work related interactions with staff and patrons are not always consistently adequate to carry out the responsibilities of the position or at times may have a detrimental effect on staff and patrons. Contributions to library-wide, departmental and/or unit efforts are not consistently satisfactory. Needs to improve knowledge in major areas related to the position in order to perform fully satisfactorily.

Level 1: Performance is unsatisfactory in one or more major areas of responsibility; is not successfully responding to directions and suggestions for improvements. Services rendered or products generated are frequently not acceptable in terms of quality, quantity or timeliness. Work does not reflect an understanding of the relevant basic principles or of the Libraries policies, practices and priorities. Work related interactions with other staff and users are frequently not adequate to carry out the responsibilities of the position or have a detrimental effect on staff or patrons. Contributions to library-wide, departmental and/or unit efforts are not satisfactory. Knowledge in major areas related to the position is insufficient to perform satisfactorily. Supervisors have documented and discussed with the employee the level of performance.

The following grid summarizes the assessment categories and levels of performance.

	Level 5	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
Quality of Products and/or service generated	Exceptionally High	High	Fully Acceptable	Sometimes But Not Always Acceptable	Unacceptable
Productivity: Fulfillment of responsibility,e.g., Timeliness, follow-through, prioritization, amount of work performed	Exceptionally High	High	Fully Acceptable	Sometimes But Not Always Acceptable	Unacceptable
Workplace interactions	Exceptionally Effective	Highly Effective	Fully Effective	Sometime But Not Always Effective	Ineffective
Contributions to unit, department and/or library efforts, e.g., contributions at meetings; suggesting solutions as well as identifying problems; giving constructive input; committee contributions	Exceptionally High	High	Fully Acceptable	Sometimes But Not Always Acceptable	Unacceptable
Supervision/Management	Exceptionally Effective	Highly Effective	Fully Acceptable	Sometimes But Not Always Effective	Ineffective

STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

GUIDELINES FOR EXEMPT/ACADEMIC STAFF PERFORMANCE APPRAISALS

POLICY

It is the policy of the University Libraries that each salaried employee be given a written performance appraisal at least once every twelve months. The general guides below should be followed when preparing performance appraisals:

(a) Only behavior should be addressed, not attitudes.

(b) Performance appraisals should contain no surprises. Only problems already identified and discussed should be included.

(c) Reference to technical or operational matters should be described so that they will be clearly understood by persons not connected with the department.

(d) In case of multiple assignments, each assignment should be treated separately.

(e) Evaluations should refer to specific and demonstrated results or outputs.

1. Performance appraisals for employees filling temporary positions of less than one year will be conducted near or at the conclusion of the term. This allows the individual to benefit from the review and gives the library a record of performance.

2. An appraisal will not be conducted if: a) the employee is on leave for at least nine months of the twelve-month period, or b) the employee is ill and on sick leave for at least nine months of the twelve-month period. In either instance, a statement as to why the individual is not being reviewed shall be placed in his/her personnel file.

3. If the employee's supervisor is ill or on leave, or that supervisory position is vacant, the next higher level supervisor should insure that the appraisal is completed. This may be accomplished by the supervisor at the next higher level writing the appraisal or by that person coordinating the comments of other individuals who can speak to the individual's work. In situations where the supervisor has been on leave for an extended period of time, or has supervised the employee for a short period of time, the supervisor at the next higher level, in consultation with the appropriate director and the Library Personnel Officer, will decide who should contribute to the appraisal.

4. When an employee's supervisor resigns and leaves the Stanford University Libraries, the supervisor will make every effort to complete the employee's appraisal before leaving or within the next few months to provide a complete appraisal even if the supervisor's employment requirement to appraise would no longer pertain. The supervisor may provide an oral evaluation of the individual's performance to the department chief who will incorporate the evaluation into the final written appraisal.

5. Although every employee is to be evaluated by their primary supervisor, it is acceptable that a person to whom the individual reports in a secondary capacity may perform an appraisal every other year. In these cases, the individual reports to one or two other individuals for assignments constituting less than half of the work effort and where the secondary supervisor may be consulted by the primary supervisor with respect to merit increases and promotions or career decisions. The secondary supervisor may provide a separate appraisal which may or may not be completed during the annual appraisal process.

6. Performance appraisals may be conducted at any time during an academic year. However, since the appraisal has a direct bearing on the salary merit recommendation, the annual appraisal will be done in the months immediately prior to the time when salary recommendations are needed. Therefore, January and February are the most desirable times for the annual performance appraisal. Individuals to whom a large number report would, of course, be well advised to spread the appraisals out over a longer period that may extend to four or five months.

7. Where an individual is evaluated in the same position by the same supervisor for a number of years running, it can be reasonable for the performance appraisal to be much more brief than for a person who is new, in transition, has just been promoted or reassigned, has a new supervisor, or one where the performance level has strengthened or weakened markedly. When none of these cases apply and the performance is judged to be entirely consistent within the last several years, the supervisor should still cover the basic points in the library guidelines for appraisals, should stress altered library activities that may have affected the position workload levels, special projects or committee work, etc., and is expected every year to have a conference to discuss work performance and to set goals for the coming year.

12/83

STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

EXEMPT AND ACADEMIC STAFF-LIBRARIES

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

Name of Employee_____ Library Unit_____

Classification_____ Date of Review_____

WHEN COMPLETING THIS FORM, PLEASE REFER TO THE ULC GUIDELINES FOR PERFORMANCE APPRAISALS WHICH DISCUSS AREAS TO BE TREATED IN EACH APPRAISAL. ALL ANSWERS SHOULD BE ATTACHED TO THIS FORM.

The purpose of appraisals is to document the total contribution which each employee makes to the program of the libraries, to contribute to planning in the libraries by means of individual goal-setting, and to enable staff to see relationships between their performance and responsibilities and their compensation. At the same time, this is an opportunity to examine career progress and explore ways to aid the employee's development.

This performance appraisal is to consist of a) this cover sheet; b) a copy of last year's goals; c) an up-to-date position description for the employee (if responsibilities have changed substantially, write "revised" on the description); d) the supervisor's appraisal of the employee's performance; e) the employee's response to the questions listed on the reverse of this sheet; and f) the work-related and/or professional goals established by the two during the course of their discussions on the appraisal. The supervisor's copy of this cover sheet is to be signed by both when all the elements (a to f) have been assembled and discussed.

"We have assembled all of the data specified above, discussed the appraisal, and agreed on the goals listed."

_____ Employee _____ Date

_____ Supervisor _____ Date

Reviewed:

_____ Department Chief _____ Date

_____ Cognizant Director _____ Date

_____ Director _____ Date

Rev. 12/83

SUPERVISOR'S INSTRUCTIONS

1. List the performance criteria (production goals, standards, etc.) that you have established for this position and, based on those criteria, evaluate the employee's achievement of the goals last set. If they were not achieved satisfactorily, state the reasons.

2. How well does the employee carry out the responsibilities described in the position description? a) levels of competence; b) productivity; c) contributions to the objectives of the Library and the University; d) individual potential and career development; e) communications.

3. For those with supervisory/managerial responsibilities: a) Describe the employee's general knowledge and background in the Library organization and operation which affect his/her ability to supervise or manage; b) Evaluate the employee's supervisory and managerial skills; c) Evaluate the employee's communication skills in relationships with staff; d) Discuss the employee's commitment to and efforts toward staff development; e) If the employee has responsibility for hiring regular staff, or provides significant input into hiring decisions, what is his/her knowledge of and contribution to the affirmative actions goals of the Library and the University? How does he/she work toward these goals? f) Discuss briefly the performance of the unit for which the employee is responsible, taking into account the service goals of your department.

EMPLOYEE INSTRUCTIONS

1. Please respond to the following: a) Evaluate your own performance in view of the performance criteria, your qualifications and the job description; b) Describe the impact of any problems you encountered in achieving the goals which you and your supervisor established and in performing your job as described. List ways that these problems can be eliminated; c) State your expectations of your supervisor and evaluate his/her effectiveness as a supervisor; d) Identify areas in which the Libraries can help by providing opportunities for further professional growth; e) Respond to your supervisor's evaluation.

GOALS INSTRUCTIONS

A statement of specific goals to be worked on during the coming year is to be completed by both the employee and the supervisor after their earlier discussions. Normally, each will bring a draft list of goals to the appraisal discussion and will arrive at a consensus on the goals for the next year during the course of that discussion. Effective career development depends upon careful planning for the future, and establishing work-related professional and personal goals can be a useful way of carrying out this planning for individuals.

1. Discuss here professional goals on which you both agree for the coming year.
2. Try to relate the goals to the goals and objectives of the department and to the position description of the employee receiving the appraisal.

3. Indicate what help from the Library or the supervisor or other sources such as training programs, courses, etc., would be particularly helpful in fulfilling any of the goals outlined above.

Note: Academic staff may refer to Page 6 of the Personnel Program for Academic Staff-Libraries for more information. Exempt staff may refer to Guide Memo 22:11, No. 4, for more information. Career development goals related to promotion and continuing appointment decisions for Academic staff should be included.

Name_____

Date_____

ANNUAL ACTIVITIES REPORT FORM

The Library Personnel Office would like to have a record of the activities of staff members for the current year. This report is intended to provide this information and will become a part of the permanent personnel file for each individual.

Please attach this form to your performance appraisal, or return it separately if you are not being reviewed at this time.

PLEASE TYPE (Use extra sheet if necessary)

1. Committee work, offices held, special assignments, etc.

2. Course work (Include name of institution and titles of courses)
   (a) Audit

   (b) Credit

3. Seminars, Workshops, Conferences, etc. (include name of conference, date and place)

4. Teaching (institution, department, course name and number, quarter or semester)

(over)

5. Speeches (place, date, group addressed, title of address)

6. Publications (as author, co-author, editor, compiler, etc.). Please give <u>exact</u> citations for articles or books.

7. Consulting Projects

8. Volunteer Activities

9. Other

Stanford University Libraries

Guidelines for Non-Exempt Performance Appraisals

POLICY

1. It is the policy of the University Libraries that each salaried employee be given a written performance appraisal at least once every twelve months. The general guides below should be followed when preparing performance appraisals:

   (a) Only behavior should be addressed, not attitudes.

   (b) Performance appraisals should contain no surprises. Only problems already identified and discussed should be included.

   (c) Reference to technical or operational matters should be described so that they will be clearly understood by persons not connected with the department.

   (d) In case of multiple assignments, each assignment should be treated separately.

   (e) Evaluations should refer to specific and demonstrated results or outputs.

SCHEDULE

2. Performance appraisals should be conducted according to the following schedule:

A. New-hire; promotion	Review at 3 and 6 months and annually thereafter (accelerated or decelerated progress and leaves of absence without pay will change this schedule). During the first few weeks of employment, supervisors should discuss with new employees performance criteria and the goals they will be expected to achieve during the probationary period and/or the first year.
B. Change in assignment	If there is a change in the supervisor-supervisee relationship, there should be a review to the date of change; the new supervisor should prepare an appraisal within 6 months of the date of the change.
C. Performance	If job performance changes substantially from that recorded in the previous appraisal (either improvement or deterioration), the Department Chief, Director or supervisor should initiate an appraisal.
D. Personal	A staff member may request a review at any time.

3. An appraisal will not be conducted if: a) the employee is on leave for at least nine months of the twelve month period (or 3/4 of a shorter period), or b) the employee is ill and on disability for at least nine months of the twelve month period. In either case, the supervisor should write a memorandum to the Library Personnel Office stating why she/he is not writing an appraisal. The memorandum will be filed in the employee's personnel file which is kept in the Library Personnel Office.

4. Department chiefs/unit heads can stagger appraisals for staff in the merit zone from October to March, with the concurrence of the Assistant Library Personnel Officer. If an appraisal has been completed within six months of the scheduled appraisal/salary review date and performance has not changed significantly, a full appraisal will not be necessary. In that case, the supervisor is required to send a memorandum to the Assistant Library Personnel Officer stating that the performance level has not changed and listing new goals, if necessary.

5. Any performance appraisal schedule changes requested by a Library department or unit should be addressed to and approved by the Assistant Library Personnel Officer who monitors the process.

6. Staff entering new positions will receive an employment confirmation letter which contains the dates of their performance reviews.

PROCEDURE

7. The employee's immediate supervisor writes the appraisal and coordinates the process. If the employee's supervisor is ill or on leave, or that supervisory position is vacant, the supervisor at the next higher level should ensure that the appraisal is completed, either by writing the appraisal him/herself or by coordinating the comments of others who can speak to the employee's work.

8. When an employee's supervisor resigns and leaves the Stanford University Libraries, the supervisor will make every effort to complete the appraisal before leaving. The supervisor may provide an oral evaluation of the individual's performance to the Department Chief who will incorporate this evaluation into the final written appraisal.

9. In cases where an employee reports to more than one supervisor, these supervisors may share the task of evaluation.

10. When an individual is evaluated in the same position by the same supervisor for a number of years and performance is judged to be entirely consistent, the performance appraisal may be briefer. The supervisor should still cover the basic points listed in the Supervisor's Instructions stressing altered library activities that may have affected the position, workload levels, special projects or committee work, etc. A conference to discuss work performance and to set goals for the coming year should be held annually.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

NON-EXEMPT

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

Name of Employee_____Library Unit_____

Classification_____Date of Review_____

WHEN COMPLETING THIS FORM, PLEASE REFER TO THE SUL GUIDELINES FOR NON-EXEMPT PERFORMANCE APPRAISALS WHICH DISCUSS AREAS TO BE TREATED IN EACH APPRAISAL. ALL WRITTEN COMMENTS SHOULD BE ATTACHED TO THIS FORM.

The purpose of appraisals is to document the total contribution which each employee makes to the program of the Libraries, to contribute to planning in the Libraries by means of individual goal-setting, and to enable staff to see relationships between their performance and responsibilities and their compensation. At the same time, this is an opportunity to examine career progress and explore ways to aid the employee's development.

This performance appraisal is to consist of a) this cover sheet; b) a copy of last year's goals; c) an up-to-date position description for the employee (if responsibilities have changed substantially, write "revised" on the description); d) the supervisor's appraisal of the employee's performance; e) the employee's response to the questions listed on the reverse of this sheet; and f) goals established by the two during the course of their discussions on the appraisal; g) Annual Activities Report Form. The supervisor's copy of this cover sheet is to be signed by both when all the elements (a to g) have been assembled and discussed.

"We have assembled all of the data specified above, discussed the appraisal, and agreed on the goals listed."

_____Employee_____Date

_____Supervisor_____Date

Reviewed:

_____Department Chief_____Date

_____Cognizant Director_____Date

Rev. 12/83

SUPERVISOR'S INSTRUCTIONS

1. List the performance criteria (production goals, standards, etc.) that you have established for this position and, based on those critera, evaluate the employee's achievement of the goals last set. If they were not achieved satisfactorily, state the reasons.

2. Citing specific examples, describe the employee's performance in terms of a) the job description; b) levels of competence; c) productivity; d) communication skills; e) contributions to the objectives of the unit, the Libraries and the University: f) individual potential and career development.

3. For those with supervisory/managerial responsibilities; a) Describe the employee's general knowledge of and background in the Libraries' organization and operation and how he/she uses it to supervise or manage; b) Evaluate the employee's supervisory and managerial skills, including communication skills, commitment to and efforts toward staff development, and knowledge of and contribution to the affirmative action goals of the Libraries and the University; c) Describe and evaluate the performance of the unit for which the employee is responsible, taking into account the service goals of your department.

EMPLOYEE INSTRUCTIONS

Please respond to the following: a) Evaluate your own performance in view of the performance criteria, your qualifications and the job description; b) Describe the impact of any problems you encountered in achieving the goals which you and your supervisor established and in performing your job as described. List ways that these problems can be eliminated; c) State your expectations of your supervisor and evaluate his/her effectiveness as a supervisor; d) Identify areas in which the Libraries can help by providing opportunities for further professional growth; e) Respond to your supervisor's evaluation.

GOALS INSTRUCTIONS

A statement of specific goals to be worked on during the coming year is to be compiled by the employee and the supervisor after the appraisal conference. Normally, each will bring a draft list of goals to the appraisal discussion and will arrive at a consensus on the goals for the next year during the course of that discussion. Effective career development depends upon careful planning for the future, and establishing work-related professional and personal goals can be a useful way of carrying out this planning for individuals.

1. State professional and personal goals on which you both agree for the coming year.

2. Relate the goals to the goals and objectives of the department and/or the Libraries, and to the position description of the employee.

3. Indicate what help from the supervisor or the Libraries or other sources such as training programs, courses, etc., would be particularly helpful in fulfilling any of the goals outlined.

4. Indicate a reasonable time frame for the completion of each goal. This could include intermediate due dates on sections of long-term projects.

MOTIVATION/JOB SATISFACTION

1. My supervisor has good/limited/poor understanding of what motivates me.

    a. Gives credit where credit is due on individual basis.

    b. Gives public recognition of other's contributions.

    c. Gives public recognition of my contributions.

    d. Encourages my participation in staff development activities when appropriate.

    e. Understands my capabilities and limitations within the context of my job description.

    f. Recognizes my potential beyond the job description.

    g. Supports initiative and innovation.

    h. Makes me feel I am working with, rather than for, him/her.

    i. Conveys a clear understanding of how I fit in the organization.

    j. Supervisor exhibits enthusiasm for his/her own work.

    k. Generates team spirit.

    l. Knows what aspects of my job I enjoy most.

    m. Other

2. Supervisor adequately explains University budget programs and how they affect my salary.

3. Supervisor makes clear the relationship between the needs of the organization, my areas of responsibility, and my level of classification.

4. Supervisor makes clear the relationship between my performance in my classification and my salary increase.

COMMUNICATION

My supervisor

1. Gives clear work assignments and adequate instructions.
2. Makes clear his/her expectations of me and my work.
3. Makes clear my areas of authority/responsibility.
4. Keeps me informed on matters affecting me and my work.
5. Lets me feel free to ask questions, express ideas and give constructive criticism.
6. Provides frequent feedback on my job performance.
7. Gives me guidelines well in advance on how I will be evaluated.
8. Is considerate of my needs in communicating with me.
9. Gives sufficient explanation of changes in assignments and routines.
10. Takes the time to talk and listen when asked.
11. Uses the performance appraisal process in a valuable way.
12. Keeps confidences.

STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR LIBRARY AFFAIRS MERIT SALARY SYSTEM

Library Affairs is committed to excellence in instructional support/ teaching, research/creative activity, service, and administration. In pursuit of this, Library Affairs encourages its faculty to adhere to high standards and criteria for performance in these areas. Such performance deserves recognition and it is the purpose of this document to set forth guidelines for evaluating performance for merit salary increases, consistent with the University's "Faculty Salary Increase Plan" adopted April 9, 1985.

The fiscal units within Library Affairs differ considerably in their operations and goals. The faculty vary significantly in work assignments as well as in specific strengths and interest. Each fiscal unit, therefore, will determine its own standards and criteria, within the scale described below, subject to approval of the faculty of that unit but conforming to broader standards and procedures of Library Affairs.

Although the mission of Library Affairs is best served by allowing faculty members to negotiate roles appropriate to their strengths and individual assignments, the merit system is designed to encourage and reward performance which helps to achieve both individual and organizational goals. Library Affairs recognizes the interrelated nature of instructional support, research, service, and administration. This implies that, in general, faculty would contribute to most, if not all, of these areas, but that the proportions might vary. The merit system must have enough flexibility to allow for instances where outstanding performance in one or two areas might balance lesser achievement in the other(s). The specific tasks defining each of these areas vary among the fiscal units. They are detailed in the Library Affairs Faculty Bylaws Appendices.

The merit evaluation system recognizes five levels of performance:

Outstanding/superior This category describes those who, among their professional colleagues, have consistently demonstrated exceptional knowledge, ability, and accomplishment. Such performance, attested by one's supervisor or peers, would, by definition, be attained by relatively few individuals.

Exceeds standard expectations This category describes those whose achievement and contribution is of a substantial nature, though not consistently exceptional. Such performance clearly would be beyond the expected level of quality in meeting assigned responsibilities.

Acceptable level This category is the performance level that would be the normal expectation for Library Affairs faculty. It describes those who are dependable in accomplishing their assigned duties and responsibilities but who seldom exceed expectations.

Minimal level This category describes those whose performance is less than adequate in assigned duties and responsibilities. Faculty who receive this evaluation should be aware of their performance deficiencies and should be strongly encouraged to correct them, with the advice and assistance of their supervisors, director/curator, and dean.

Unacceptable level This category describes those whose performance is without merit.

It is important that each faculty member pay careful attention to the specific criteria which lead to an evaluation, as established and defined by the fiscal units within Library Affairs. Consistency in administering the merit system is crucial, however, and the possible differences which might arise within the unit should be resolved at the director/curator level. In

addition, the dean will insure that the standards are applied equitably throughout Library Affairs.

Because merit evaluation is based on individual achievements, each faculty member should have direct involvement in determining individual goals and activities. At the beginning of the calendar year each faculty member, in consultation with the appropriate supervisor, should complete the "Library Affairs Negotiated Weights for Activities" form. This form provides guidelines for the documentation which will be needed at the end of the year to demonstrate accomplishment in each of the described areas. Specific commitments in each of the areas of instructional support, research, service, and administration may vary not only from one individual to another, but also from one year to another. In addition, there may be differences of emphasis between tenured and nontenured faculty members. Although the negotiated role should reflect the strengths and needs of the individual faculty member, it also should support and be consistent with the goals and mission of the department, Library Affairs, and the University.

At the beginning of each year there will be an annual review for merit, covering the previous year, according to steps established in "Procedures for Library Affairs Faculty Merit Evaluation." Each faculty member is responsible for documenting effectiveness in the appropriate areas of instructional support, research, service, and administration as reflected in the Negotiated Weights form. This evidence may be both written and oral. The supervisor, director/curator, and dean, as appropriate, are responsible for justifying the merit rating based upon the available evidence. Both parties shall have the opportunity to respond to the evaluation prior to signing the evaluation form. Faculty members who disagree with their evaluation may appeal it in accordance with established grievance procedures.

The merit evaluation will be made on an eight point scale, with the verbal categories described earlier corresponding to the numbers as illustrated below.

8 Outstanding/superior

7

6 Exceeds standard expectations

5

4 Acceptable

3

2 Minimal

1

0 Without merit

Persons whose performance does not precisely fit one of the described levels would receive a rating of the numerical value between the labelled categories. Weights for instructional support, research, service, and administration are based on the percent of effort which had been negotiated earlier for this evaluation period.

The determination of specific dollar amounts per merit point shall be the responsibility of each fiscal unit's director/curator working with the dean to assure equity of application within Library Affairs.

This statement of standards and criteria is to be implemented through the "Library Affairs Merit Evaluation Form and Procedures."

Library Affairs Faculty Merit Evaluation Form

This form shall be used annually for the purpose of merit salary recommendations. All ratings must be justified and the evaluation must be discussed by the evaluator and the evaluatee. After review by the appropriate Director/Curator, it will be forwarded to the Administration Office where it may be reviewed by the Dean and then retained for the personnel files.

In cases where this form is used for improvement evaluations, the form becomes the property of the evaluatee and may be used at his/her discretion.

Performance evaluation descriptors	Assigned numerical value
Outstanding/superior	7-8 range
Exceeds standard expectations	5-6 range
Acceptable	3-4 range
Minimal	1-2 range
Without merit	0

_____ _____
(name of faculty member being evaluated) (title of evaluatee)

_____ _____
(name of evaluator) (title of evaluator)

I have met with the evaluator, discussed this evaluation, and included any appropriate comments.

_____ _____
(date of discussion) (evaluatee's signature)

_____ _____
(time period covered by evaluation) (evaluator's signature)

INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT/TEACHING

(weight) x (rating) = (weighted rating)

Summary of negotiated activities:

Justification of rating:

RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

(weight)	x	(rating)	=	(weighted rating)

Summary of negotiated activities:

Justification of rating:

SERVICE

(weight) x (rating) = (weighted rating)

Summary of negotiated activities:

Justification of rating:

ADMINISTRATION

(weight) x (rating) = (weighted rating)

Summary of negotiated activities:

Justification of rating:

FINAL MERIT RATING

Weighted Rating for Instructional Support/Teaching _____

Weighted Rating for Research/Creative Activities + _____

Weighted Rating for Service + _____

Weighted Rating for Administration + _____

FINAL MERIT RATING = _____

Additional Comments by Evaluator:

Additional Comments by Evaluatee:

NEGOTIATED WEIGHTS FOR ACTIVITIES: Calendar Year 1986

Faculty member: _____

I. Instructional Support/Teaching:

Weight (percentage of total effort): _____

II. Research/Creative Activities:

Weight (percentage of total effort): _____

III. Service:

Weight (percentage of total effort): _____

IV. Administration:

Weight (percentage of total effort): _____

Total effort: 100%

Initials: _____ _____
(evaluatee) (evaluator)

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY

LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION FACULTY
MERIT AWARDS: DISTRIBUTION GUIDELINES & PROCEDURES 1986-87

Merit review for library administration faculty is conducted annually subject to the availability and distribution of merit money within the Collective Bargaining Agreement. The annual performance reviews ("KSU Library Faculty Evaluation"), as well as other materials described in this document, are used by the CAC and the Director of Libraries to identify faculty who have made contributions to their units and the Libraries, and to reward them within University guidelines in a differential manner according to the level and quality of the individual's achievements and contributions. All procedures and guidelines are consistent with the Collective Bargaining Agreement negotiated by the University and the Faculty Association as of August 25, 1985.

The two category approach will be in use again this year. These categories are:

(1) Teaching/Service, Including Advising
(2) Research/Scholarly Activity.

This document presents the procedures and guidelines to be used by the CAC to "make recommendation to the appropriate departmental chairperson/school director/regional campus dean as to the appropriate rank-ordering of faculty for merit awards in each of the two categories..." ("CBU Faculty Salary Distribution Guidelines" memo from Vice President Moore (2/4/86)). Library Administration Faculty wishing to be considered for merit must make written application and furnish appropriate documentation to the Director of Libraries by April 20, 1987.

The memo from Vice President Moore also indicates that "The twin values to guide the process are: Awards are to go to truly 'meritorious' faculty in each of the categories, demonstrably above the standard level of expected performance and achievement. The most meritorious faculty within a category and in terms of receiving awards in both categories are to be rewarded accordingly."

The principal focus of merit consideration will be the period April 1, 1986 to March 31, 1987. Recognition for contributions made prior to April 1, 1986 are not included in the preliminary guidelines from Dr. James P. Louis, associate Dean & Director, Office of Faculty Relations.

CRITERIA

The individual requesting consideration for a merit increase must have exceeded expected levels of job performance for those in similar positions. Demands beyond one's assigned duties also will be considered.

Since the merit review process is intended to establish the appropriate merit increases to be awarded, individuals applying for merit will be compared to one another first within their own units and then at the Library level by members of the CAC. The CAC will strive to provide a level of equity for comparing individuals from different units who have been evaluated by different supervisors.

(1) TEACHING/SERVICE, INCLUDING ADVISING

Performance in the duties assigned shall be judged in lieu of teaching competency. The chief factor in the merit review for this category is job performance. However, "service" is also to be considered. The weighting of the evaluation criteria shall be 80% for job performance and 20% for service.

(A) JOB PERFORMANCE

Merely fulfilling the minimal requirements of a position is insufficient for merit consideration. Rather, the requester must exert special effort in the performance of his or her job-related activities. The individual's annual performance evaluation will be used as a principal basis for assessing a candidate's performance during the period for which merit is being considered.

Factors to be Considered (As appropriate)

1. Organization of Work
   --Analyzes & systematizes methods of time
2. Work Accomplished
   --Quality & quantity
3. Accuracy
   --Freedom from mistakes
4. Thoroughness
   --Perserverence; follows through to completion
5. Judgment
   --Ability to make balanced decisions
6. Technical & Professional Knowledge
   --Familiarity with skills, tools and professional developments
7. Professional Activities
8. Initiative
   --Ability to act creatively and effectively
9. Self-Development
   --Eagerness to improve and advance
10. Co-operativeness
    --Ability to work for the entire organization when necessary
11. Communication
    --Shares information orally and in writing
12. Supervisory Ability
13. Ability to Train
14. Ability to Judge Personnel
15. Leadership
    --Ability to stimulate

Sources of Information or Documentation

1. Annual Performance Evaluation
2. Personnel Folder Items
3. "Activities performed from April 1, 1986 through March 31, 1987

(B) SERVICE

Service is expected of all faculty members. Consequently, only service beyond that normally expected is to be considered as justification for a merit increase. This is especially true of service within the University and the Library. Membership in an external organization or professional association is not in itself indicative of service. There should be some evidence or description of actual involvements or active participation by the individual seeking merit.

Review of service contributions should consider the nature and importance of the organization, the level of service in the organization, and the substance of the contribution.

The following measures of service activities are suggested as a criterion-referenced basis for evaluating an individual's service record:

1. Professional Contributions on the Library Level
   (a) Participation on Committees, Advisory Councils, Task Forces, and other activities, as assigned. --Individual and group accomplishments should be described or documented to provide evidence of contribution.

2. Professional Contributions on a University Level
   (a) Chair of a University Committee
   (b) Member of a University Committee
   (c) Other, e.g., member of Faculty Senate, etc.

3. Professional Contributions on a National, State or Regional Level
   (a) Election to office in a professional association

   (b) Nomination/Candidacy for office in a professional association
   (c) Chair of a committee in a association
   (d) Committee member of a committee in a association

4. Professional Contribution as a Consultant on a Library-Related Project

Sources of Information or Documentation
   1. Annual Performance Evaluation
   2. Personnel Folder Items
   3. "Activities performed from April 1, 1986 through March 31, 1987

(2) RESEARCH/SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

The Library's Promotion Policies and Procedures states:

Research/scholarship may be demonstrated through either publication or additional education. Publication may take various forms. Examples include journal articles, books, chapters of books, audio visuals, etc. Graduate education may also be considered as evidence of research and scholarship because it requires the diligent, protracted investigation and studious inquiry which, by its very nature, defines true research or scholarship.

These statements form the basis for evaluating the research and scholarly records of candidates for merit increases. The following measures of research and scholarly activity are suggested as a criterion-referenced basis for evaluating an individual's research/scholarship record:

1. Research/Publication
   - (a) Books (Full-length monographs)
   - (b) Refereed articles
   - (c) Chapters in books
   - (d) Non-refereed publications
   - (e) Editorial Activity
   - (f) Papers presented at National, State or Regional Professional Meetings
   - (g) Papers presented at other forums
   - (h) Reviews
     --Generally expected of professional librarians, should be of substantial quantity or quality

   - (i) Creative Works
     --Generally qualifies for consideration only if such a work is in the individual's subject specialty or enhances his or her national reputation. The amount of credit to be awarded is contingent on favorable reviews from well-established impartial sources.

2. Additional Education
   - (a) Completion of a graduate degree
   - (b) Courses completed toward a graduate degree
   - (c) Courses taken in a non-degree program
   - (d) Continuing Education courses

NOTE: Classwork should be job-related or directed toward the development of a subject specialty. This education may take the form of another master's degree in a subject field, an M.L.S. if that degree is a second graduate degree, or a Ph. D. in a subject discipline.

NOTE: Classwork taken at the request of the Library Administration will be considered as Job Performance, not in the category of Additional Education.

Sources of information and documentation:

Sources of Information or Documentation

1. Annual Performance Evaluation
2. Personnel Folder Items
3. "Activities performed from April 1, 1986 through March 31, 1987

PROCEDURES

All faculty members who wish to be considered for merit should submit a letter requesting this consideration, along with the appropriate documentation file, to the Director of Libraries no later than April 20, 1987.

The CAC will then review and evaluate the documentation. They will recommend an appropriate priority-ordering in terms of degree of meritorious performance in accord with the respective specified Merit Criteria for each of the two merit categories.

Selected Reading List

SELECTED READING LIST

American Library Association. "Personnel and Employment: Performance Appraisal." ALA Yearbook, 1976-1980 inclusive.

American Library Association/LAMA/PAS. "Performance Appraisal: A Guide for Libraries." Chicago: 1979.

Burton, Eileen. "Measuring the Effectiveness of a Performance Appraisal System." (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Washington, 1979).

Evans, G. Edward. "Another Look at Performance Appraisal in Libraries." Journal of Library Administration 3(2) (Summer 1982): 61-69.

Fear, Richard A. The Evaluation Interview. 3rd. ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Governer's Office of Employee Relations. "Making Performance Appraisal Work." Albany, New York: 1986.

Horn, Judy. "Peer Review for Librarians and Its Application in ARL Libraries," in: Academic Libraries: Myths and Realities. Chicago, ACRL, 1984, pp. 135-140.

Lindsey, Jonathan A. Performance Evaluation: A Management Basic for Librarians. Phoenix: Oryx, 1986.

McGregor, Douglas. "An Uneasy Look at Performance Appraisal." Harvard Business Review 35 (1957): 89-94. Reprinted in Harvard Business Review 50 (1972): 133-138.

Sashkin, Marshall. A Manager's Guide to Performance Management. New York, American Management Association, 1986.

USES OF SPEC KITS

The Systems and Procedures Exchange Center (SPEC) is a clearinghouse operated by the Association of Research Libraries, Office of Management Studies that provides a central source of timely information and materials on the management and operations of large academic and research libraries. It facilitates the exchange of knowledge and documents through SPEC Kits, which are distributed ten times each year to ARL members and other interested libraries. The Kits include topically-arranged groupings of unedited primary source documents – selected for their value to administrators and decision-makers – that illustrate a wide range of alternative approaches to specfic issues.

Kit documents come from general membership surveys and from selected libraries contacted directly by SPEC, and most Kits are produced within six months of surveys. The documents' value comes from their variety of ideas, methods, and solutions. They are not viewed as finished products, but rather as points of departure for a library's planning efforts and as stimulants to innovative approaches to problem-solving. As such, Kits do not present answers or prescriptions for any one library; instead they illustrate how selected ARL members are planning for or dealing with particular issues. The worth of any one Kit to a particular library will depend upon the specific topic covered and the library's stage of development in that area.

Materials are selected according to the following criteria:

- Presents an approach of potential value to administrators and decision-makers
- Timely, and dealing directly with the topic under consideration
- Probability of application of ideas or thinking to other library situations
- Illustrative of actual practice, rather than theoretical
- Understandable, readable communication

All together, the materials should provide a range of alternative approaches that complement each other, provide variety, and stimulate comparison and contrast.

Libraries can take advantage of the Kit compilations in a number of ways. Administrators can evaluate the assumptions, methods, and results of other libraries' approaches; compare and contrast them; and use the learnings in their own situations. Library staff members can use the kits as professional development and current awareness tools. Committees and task forces can use them to begin a review of current practices. And the Kits can identify other persons or places to contact for further information. Back-up files in the SPEC office also are available for loan to member libraries. In addition, SPEC will conduct on-demand surveys or analyses geared specifically for a single library.

EVALUATION

Kit Title/Number _____

1. Which uses did the library make of this Kit?

2. Please indicate how useful the Kit was for these purposes.

☐ Very Useful ☐ Quite Useful ☐ Somewhat Useful ☐ Not Useful

3. Do you have suggestions for this Kit or for future Kits?

(optional) NAME _____

LIBRARY _____

PHONE _____

Please return this form to the SPEC Center, OMS/ARL, 1527 New Hampshire Ave., N.W., Washington, DC 20036.

1/82